XIII

REPORT

OF THE

LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH;

FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1885.

By G. E. KNOX, Esq., C.S.,
Acting Legal Remembrancer to Govt., N. W. P. and Oudh.

ALLAHABAD:
NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH GOVERNMENT PRESS.
1886

ERRATA.

Page	1	line	5	...	...	...	For "1884," read "1885."
"	4	line	13	from bottom		...	" "Rs. 41,403," read "Rs. 41,363."
"	4	"	12	"	"	...	" "83," read "84."
"	9	"	15	"	"	...	" "five" read "twelve," and for "in which the Court was plaintiff and lost the claim," read "in which the Court of Wards were losers."
"	9	"	10	"	"	...	" "seven cases lost by the Court as defendant," read "seven other cases lost by the Court."
"	10	"	1	"	"	...	" "one hundred and forty two," read "eighty-three."
"	...	"	7	"	"	...	" "six," read "ten."
"	...	"	23	"	"	...	After "Anapur estate," insert "and one on behalf of estate Mashuk Mahal Begam."
"	11	"	13	"	"	...	" "Husaini Begam," add "and Husaini Begam." For "daughter," read "daughters."
"	14	"	4	"	"	...	" "Moradabad," read "Budaun."
"	17	"	11	"	"	...	" "Rs. 771," read "Rs. 7,471."
"	...	"	2	"	"	...	" "C." read "D."
"	6A. last column 7 line				"	" ...	" "6,978" read "6,878."
"	14A. last line				"	" ...	" "Rs. 6,58,851," read "Rs. 6,48,851."
"	15A.		"		"	" ...	" "Rs. 82,628" read "Rs. 6,82,628."
"	16A. last line but one				"	" ...	" "Rs. 20,976," read "Rs. 6,168."
"	...	"	"	"	"	" ...	" "Rs. 27,482," read "Rs. 7,674."
"	18A.	"	"	"	"	" ...	" "Rs 26,336-3-5" read "Rs. 36,336-3-5."
"	20A. under estate Jauli				"	" ...	" "Rs.—11—" read "Rs. 511."
"	21A. last line				"	" ...	" "Rs. 1,557," read "Rs. 1558," and for "Rs. 42,987-5-1." read "Rs. 42,987-7-11."

REPORT

OF THE

LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH,

For the Year ending 30th September, 1884.

No. 520.

FROM

G. E. KNOX, ESQ., C.S.,

Legal Remembrancer to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh,

To

J. R. REID, ESQ., C.S.,

Chief Secretary to Government, N.-W. P. and Oudh.

DATED ALLAHABAD, THE 26TH FEBRUARY, 1886

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit the annual report upon the work done in the office of the Legal Remembrancer during the year 1884-85. In spite of repeated reminders the returns made by several districts did not reach my office till late in January, 1886; the last return to come in from the North-Western Provinces was not received until the 12th February. I found it in consequence impossible to submit my report within the date prescribed.*

As promised last year the returns connected with civil litigation have been remodelled. I have not disturbed the main classification, and, as in past years, suits relating to municipalities and to estates under the management of the Court of Wards have been shown under separate sets of forms. Litigation connected with all other departments of the State has been thrown under one general head and classified as State litigation. As regards the forms contained in the appendices you will find that the first three represent the number, value, and result of suits dealt with by (i) Courts of First Instance, (ii) District Courts of Appeal, (iii) Superior Courts of Appeal. The financial results of the litigation of the year have been shown in detail in forms IV and V. In State litigation the returns have been made according to districts; but in the case of Municipal Boards and of estates under the Court of Wards, to each Board and to each estate a separate place has been assigned. A general return has been added in which the suits connected with all the three departments have been classified according to the subject-matter at issue. There was nothing to be gained by sub-dividing this last return into three in the same way as the first five tables have been treated. No change has been introduced into the form for showing the recoveries of Government dues in pauper suits.

In accordance with your instructions I now proceed to examine in regular sequence each of the forms contained in the appendices.

A—STATE.

I.—Suits by or against the State in Courts of First Instance—Forty suits from the North-Western Provinces and twenty-three from Oudh have appeared on the Cause Lists of Courts of First Instance during the year as against a total of 55 in the year immediately preceding. Of the forty in the North-Western Provinces twelve are brought by the State as plaintiff. Of the twelve eleven have been decided, and in every one of them the claim brought by the State was declared good and just. One case appears in the column of suits withdrawn, but it was withdrawn only after the defendant had paid into Court the full sum for which the suit had been laid. Of

* As these sheets were passing through the Press the last returns from Oudh arrived, and the necessity of remodelling the figures and recasting the averages has delayed the final printing of the report.

twenty-eight cases brought against the State the results are as follows;—ten are still pending, eleven have been decided in favour of the State, three were compromised, one was withdrawn; and in only three was a decision given against the Government. In two out of the three suits compromised, and in the one suit which was withdrawn the claims preferred were pronounced by this office to represent equitable demands upon the State. No defence was therefore filed, and the demands made were at once met. If rules which have been lately issued to Collectors are carefully observed, I trust the cases of this kind, which find their way into Court, will be still fewer in number. If in the cases above mentioned the original notice served upon the State under section 424 of the Code of Civil Procedure had been submitted to this office soon after it had been served, the Collectors would have been advised, after sanction obtained from the Government, to satisfy the demands made. In this way costs would have been avoided and the claims still more promptly met.

There remains one case which was compromised in the Benares district. It was a demand for compensation for land and houses taken up by the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway Company. It was a suit which never passed through this office, but judging from the account given of it in the Collector's annual report a compromise was the wisest course which could have been adopted.

The net result then is that out of twenty-four suits which were contested to the end the State was successful in twenty-one—a percentage of 87 in favour of the State as against a percentage of 75 of last year.

In Oudh the State appeared as plaintiff in seven suits. Two of these remain pending; in the other five decision was in our favour. On the other hand six out of the sixteen suits in which the State was the defendant have been lost.* Of the six cases lost five have been carried into higher courts, and by them decided either in this year (1884-85) or the year immediately following in favour of the State. In the sixth, which was a claim for the recovery of possession over two bighas 17 biswas of land brought by a tenant claiming higher rights than those of tenant-at-will against the farmer of the village, the Secretary of State was only a *pro formâ* defendant.

The percentage therefore in favour of the State, though it must nominally be put at 68 per cent. as against 95 per cent. of last year, is in reality much higher; the State was as a matter of fact successful in ninety-four per cent. of the suits instituted during the year.

The three cases in which the adverse decree passed against the State has either been accepted or is still under appeal are:—

(i)—*Ganga Sahai* versus *Secretary of State.*—In this case after certain property had been made over to the Magistrate of Moradabad by the District Judge of Bareilly as property which had escheated for want of heirs, a suit was brought based upon a bond signed by the late owners of the property. When the claim was brought to the notice of this office the Government was advised not to defend the suit, and a decree was given against the property. Notice was not given to this office until after the suit had been instituted.

(ii)—*Babu Ganga Baksh Singh* versus *Manmohan Sahai and the Secretary of State.*—The claim was for several reliefs, but the only one in which the State was concerned was a plot of 17 biswas situate near the tahsil of Bansgaon. This plot was said to have been part of certain land which had been entered in the Government papers for twenty-five years past as Government property, and had been used by the successive Tahsildárs of Bansgaon as a flower garden. Upon the allegation that the entries in the Settlement papers were accurate and supported by the testimony of the tahsil officials sanction was given to defend the suit.

As a matter of fact the entry was merely "a garden," without any words to show whether such garden belonged to the State or not. Moreover the evidence

* Two out of these 16 are still pending.

produced in Court on behalf of the State went directly against the facts stated by the Collector in his narrative of the case.

(iii)—*Musammat Nidia* versus *Secretary of State.*—This was a claim for 7 bighas 12 biswas of land situate in the Gorakhpur jungles. It was really a boundary dispute. The plaintiff was successful in the lower Court, but in appeal it has been urged on behalf of the State that that Court erred in refusing to take the evidence of Mr. Nicholson, the officer who surveyed the particular spot. The District Judge has so far accepted this plea that the suit has been remanded for the taking of Mr. Nicholson's evidence and is still pending.

The cases compromised and withdrawn have been, with the exception of one case from Benares, reported to Government and sanction received for the course taken. To reproduce here the reasons for compromise and withdrawal seems unnecessary.

As regards the value of the subject-matters in dispute during the year, which amounted to Rs. 60,814, claims representing Rs. 41,699 (68 per cent.) were still awaiting decision. Of the balance only Rs. 1,061, or little more than 5 per cent., has been decreed against the State. The State recovered 25 per cent. and the balance, 2 per cent, must be attributed to cases compromised and withdrawn.

II.—Suits brought by or against the State in District Courts of Appeal.—The State won three out of the three cases in which it was appellant in the North-Western Provinces and three out of four cases in Oudh. In Oudh the fourth suit is still pending decision. It appeared as respondent in eight cases in the North-Western Provinces and in four cases in Oudh. Five of these 12 appeals are still undecided, and one has been decreed against the State. The net result is, in the North-Western Provinces, a percentage of 85 in favour of the State as against 87 in the year preceding, and in Oudh 100 per cent., just as in last year.

The one and only appeal lost was that brought by the *Secretary of State* versus *Brij Kishore Das.* The claim was an attempt on the part of the Nazúl Department to assess to rent certain persons holding shops in Firozabad on land admitted to be nazúl property. The defendant urged that he had built his shop forty years ago without any stipulation to pay rent, and had held it rent-free ever since. The suit was instituted against the express advice of my predecessor. A decree was given in favour of the State, but foreseeing that the grounds on which it issued were very doubtful, I advised that the claim for past rent should not be enforced. In the meanwhile an appeal was lodged, and the claim to assess rejected on the ground anticipated by me that the relationship of landlord and tenant had not been established to the satisfaction of the Court.

From a financial point of view, out of claims amounting to Rs. 45,175, only Rs. 52-8-0 or a percentage of ·11 has been lost. As much as 19 per cent. belongs to cases still pending, and the balance represents the claims recovered by the State *plus* an exorbitant claim successfully contested in Dehra Dún. Compensation laid at Rs. 32,300 was reduced by the Court to Rs. 2,400.

III.—Suits brought by or against the State in superior Courts of Appeal.—Before the High Court of Judicature, North-Western Provinces, the State appeared as appellant in three and respondent in seven appeals. Three were decided in its favour and three against it, leaving four pending.

The percentage in favour of the State is 50 as against 100 of last year.

Before the Judicial Commissioner of Oudh the State was cited as respondent in one case, and that case was decided in its favour.

There were two cases from Oudh before the Privy Council. In both the State was respondent. One of these two, shown in the report of the Legal Remembrancer for 1881, page 9, as Secretary of State *versus* Mohan Lal, was decided in favour of the State on the 24th June, 1885. The second case, noticed in last year's report, page 19, Rája Indrabikram Sah *versus* Secretary of State, is still pending The net result as regards Oudh is a percentage of 100 in favour of the State.

From a financial point of view, out of claims amounting to Rs. 3,97,455, the State has lost Rs. 1,281. The amount gained is Rs. 70,065. The balance belongs mainly to one large suit for Rs. 2,85,000 still pending.

The cases lost before the High Court were—

(1) Secretary of State *versus* Colonel Turton. An account of this will be found in para. 16 of last year's report.

(2) Alopi *versus* Secretary of State. This case was fully reported to you under cover of this office No. 169, dated 2nd January, 1885.

(3) Ram Ugra Singh, &c., *versus* Secretary of State. For an account of this case see appendix.

To tabulate the above results for easy reference :—

Courts.	*State*, Plaintiff or Appellant.	*State*, Defendant or Respondent.	Total.	For the State.	Against the State.	Pending.	Percentage in favour of the State
North-Western Provinces.							
Courts of First Instance	12	28	40	21	3	11*	87
District Courts in Appeal	3	8	11	6	1	4	85
Highest Courts of Appeal	3	7	10	3	3	4	50
Total ...	18	43	61	30	7	19	81
Oudh.							
Courts of First Instance	7	16	23	13	6	4	68
District Courts in Appeal	4	4	8	6	...	2	100
Highest Courts of Appeal... ...	...	3	3	2	...	1	100
Total ...	11	23	34	21	6	7	77

IV.—Realization of sums decreed due to the State.—During the year under review out of Rs. 1,843-11-1, money claims decreed in favour of the State, Rs. 1,568-8-7, or 84 per cent., was recovered. This percentage of 84 against the percentage of 10 reported last year is, I would submit, very satisfactory. A sum of Rs. 66-3-4 was awarded as interest, and Re. 1-14-6 of this was recovered.

In costs out of Rs. 653-0-2 awarded to the State, Rs. 247-15-6 have been realized—a percentage of 37 against one of 62 in the previous year. The recoveries in the Agra and Allahabad Divisions have been particularly poor. In both these divisions the Collectors report they have every hope of recovering the balances, but my experience leads me to consider all sums which are not promptly got in after a decree has been passed as of very doubtful value.

The recovery of sums outstanding has received most careful attention at my hands. The total sum to be recovered at the beginning of the year was Rs. 41,403-0-10. Of this large sum Rs. 34,748, or 83 per cent., was due to the following decrees :—

			Rs.
1.—Secretary of State *versus* Major-General Thelwall	...	...	10,092
2.—Ditto ditto Kanhaya Lal	...	...	4,062
3.—Ditto ditto Ghulam Muhammad	...	...	1,347
4.—Ditto ditto Mr. Hearsey	...	...	18,041
5.—Ditto ditto Mahárája Radhaprasada Singh	...	...	1,206
Total	...		34,748

Of the five large decrees the probability is that one must be remitted, a second has been sent to England and will perhaps be recovered in instalments. In two more the judgment-debtors were so embarrassed with other claims that the Collectors have been compelled to wait. The fifth had to remain in suspense until an appeal had been decided.

* Three cases further compromised and two withdrawn.

The remainder (Rs. 6,655) is made up of petty sums, and of this amount Rs. 213 (or 3 per cent.) have been recovered. An annual report is obviously not the place to discuss how far these decrees may be considered recoverable. Every one of them has been brought more than once during the year to the notice of the Collectors responsible for their realization, and no efforts have been spared on my part to sue out execution whenever there appeared any hope of success.

The result is a conviction that the only safe method of preventing ultimate loss to Government consists in more careful inquiry into the condition and circumstances of a defendant before suits are instituted, and more determination in suing out execution as soon as a decree has been passed. I have this year come across several instances in which no attempt was made to ascertain whether in the event of a decree being obtained the costs of the suit could be recovered. I have therefore urged and would still urge more careful adherence to the rules which require Collectors to satisfy themselves that the defendant is possessed of the means to pay before advising prosecution.

I may here be permitted to add that the Legal Remembrancer in Bengal finds it equally difficult with myself to recover outstandings. The percentage of all recoveries for the last three years in Bengal has been 2, 7 and 8 only.

In Oudh the recoveries of sums decreed during the year have been as follows :—

	Decreed.	*Realized.*	*Percentage.*
	Rs. a p.	Rs. a p.	
Claims	1,260 10 8	1,158 12 1	91
Interest	183 0 5	105 15 7	57
Costs	2,662 8 11	272 4 2	10

The percentage of recoveries, except under costs, is, as in the North-Western Provinces, considerably in advance of the percentage recovered last year.

The sums shown as outstanding in Oudh are as follows :—

	Rs. a. p.
Claims	21,451 0 0
Interest	4,326 0 0
Costs	1,436 0 0

But from these the following sums which represent the claim of Secretary of State *versus* Mohan Lal must be deducted. These items were really in suspense, for the decree of the Privy Council confirming the decree of the Judicial Commissioner was not received from England until after the year under report had closed.

They are—

	Rs.
Claims	18,100
Interest	2,625
Costs	1,293

The net balances for realization and recovery are therefore—

	Outstanding.	*Recoveries.*	*Percentage.*
	Rs.	Rs.	
Claims	3,351	886	26
Interest	1,701	264	15
Costs	143	29	20
	5,195	1,179	21

This result compares favourably with the realizations of last year, which amounted to only 7 per cent.

The largest sum outstanding is Rs. 1,644, due from Muhammad Amin. This judgment-debtor repays the amount due from him by annual instalments. Of the remaining balances nothing need be said here, beyond this that they are being carefully watched.

The sums remitted have all been duly reported to Government for sanction.

The immense difference between the interest awarded in the North-Western Provinces and in Oudh cannot fail to attract attention. It is really due to a different method of classification. In the North-Western Provinces only interest after date of decree is shown as interest. In Oudh all interest before and after decree is returned in this column. The Oudh method is the more accurate and I hope to see it followed next year in these provinces.

V.—Amount expended in litigation.—The total sum spent on litigation during the year in the North-Western Provinces amounted to Rs. 1,469 as against Rs. 3,603 spent during the previous year. Most of this, as the results in the first three annual returns show, will probably be recovered.

The receipts have been Rs. 2,078-2-1.

In Oudh the expenditure has been Rs. 195-15-0, and the receipts have amounted to Rs. 2,715.

The net result is a gain to the State of Rs. 3,129.

The following table shows the costs *incurred* and *recovered* by the State as contrasted with those *awarded* to the State :—

	Incurred.	Recovered.	Awarded.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
North-Western Provinces	1,469	247	653
Oudh	195	272	*2,662
Total ...	1,664	519	3,315

B.—MUNICIPALITIES.

I.—Suits brought by or against Municipal Boards in Courts of First Instance.—During the year under review only three claims in which Municipal Boards were plaintiffs were intrusted to this office. Two of these were decided in favour of the Municipalities interested and one remains pending. The Municipal Board of Benares instituted twenty-three suits on their own responsibility; of these 18 are still pending, two have been decided in favour of, and three against, the Municipal Board. In 25 cases more Municipal Boards were cited as defendants; twelve of these were successfully defended, two were withdrawn by the plaintiffs, and eight were decided against the Boards which had been impleaded. Four of these were decided against the Municipality of Khurja, and out of them three were conducted by that Municipal Board from first to last on its own responsibility.

(*a*) Lakhpat Rae *versus* Municipal Board, Khurja.

The fourth (*a*) was a suit for recovery of possession over 15 yards of land which the Municipality had given to one Madho in return for land taken from the said Madho to widen a road through the market occupied by sweetmeat-sellers in the town of Khurja. In their narrative of the case the Municipal Board instructed this office that the same piece of land had been made the subject of a previous suit by the relatives of the present plaintiff, and that this suit had been decided against those relatives. The matter, therefore, according to the Board's account, was virtually *res judicata*. The Munsif in his judgment appears to have ignored this plea, and to have found on the evidence that the plaintiffs were not proprietors of the land. The land he held to be a thoroughfare, and ruled that the plaintiffs had enjoyed for some time past various rights, such as those of ingress and egress over the road, burning a kiln, &c, and he ruled as follows :—

"They," the plaintiffs, "allege themselves to be owners of the land, and their witnesses state the same; but I do not think that they are owners of the land or the

*This large sum is due to costs awarded by the Privy Council in return for moneys which were of necessity expended some years previously.

street. They would not be proprietors of a thoroughfare, but the rights they have enjoyed on the land claimed entitle them to restrain others from taking possession of the land and thus depriving them of those rights."

There can be little room for doubt that this decision would not have been upheld in appeal. The Collector and Commissioner were both of opinion that the judgment was a good and sound one, and their view seems to have prevailed with the Municipal Board as against the opinion given by this office. As the Board decided not to appeal no more could be said or done in the case.

Two cases were decided against the Municipal Board of Muttra. In one the decision of the lower court was reversed the moment it went into appeal. In the second (a) the Municipal Board in their instructions to this office wrote that the plaintiff had made innovations in her building without consent first obtained. On this foundation advice was given that the suit should be defended. The Munsif, however, found on the evidence that what was called an innovation by the Municipal Board was in fact no new erection, but had existed both in the plaintiff's house and in most of the houses in the street from time immemorial. The suit was accordingly given against the Municipal Board.

(a) Gokuli Bai *versus* Municipal Board, Muttra.

One case was decided against the Municipal Board of Bareilly. In this case the Municipal Board substituted for the defence supplied by this office one of their own preparation. In their defence they contented themselves with advancing the plea that the plaintiff's allegations were incorrect, and if the suit was defended upon similar lines, it is hardly strange that they were defeated.

Sri Ram *versus* Municipal Board Bareilly.

The eighth case was decided against the Municipal Board of Gorakhpur, but the adverse decision was reversed in appeal.

The net result therefore is that out of 29 cases which were tried 11 were decided against the Municipal Boards; for seven of these no responsibility can attach to this office; in two the instructions supplied were distinctly wrong; two more were won back in appeal, and the remaining suit, if appealed, would probably have been decided in favour of the Board.

Two cases are shown as withdrawn. One of them, Powell *versus* Municipal Board, Mussoorie, will be noticed further on; the second (a) was a case brought against the Municipal Board of Bareilly; it was a claim to have an order which the Board had passed set aside.

(a) Masi-ulla Khan *versus* Municipal Board, Bareilly.

In Oudh the Municipal Board of Bara Banki are responsible for the solitary case brought by Municipalities as plaintiffs. The case is still pending. In two cases Municipal Boards were sued by private individuals; one of these was dismissed; the second claim for the possession of five trees was decided against the Municipal Board of Gonda. The case was defended under the advice of my predecessor in office. I am unable to say how it was lost, as all the information given to this office was "that the Municipal Board of Gonda having read the grounds on which the claim has been decreed are of opinion that no appeal should be made."

The net result in favour of the Municipal Boards in Oudh was 50 per cent. as against 100 per cent of last year. In the North-Western Provinces it is a nominal 59 against 85 for the preceding year.

II.—Suits brought by or against Municipal Boards in Courts of Appeal.—In one case the Municipal Board of Muttra appealed from the decree passed by the Lower Court and had that decree reversed. A second appeal brought by the Municipal Board of Gorakhpur is still pending. In seven appeals the Municipal Boards were respondents; one of these is still pending and one ended in a decision adverse to the Municipal Board of Bareilly. The remainder were decided in favour of the Boards concerned.

Lalta Prasad *versus* Municipal Board, Bareilly.

The solitary case decided against Municipalities was a claim for an injunction to prevent the Board of Bareilly from interfering with some gargoyles used for carrying rain water from the top of a house on to the brick pavement below. As in the rainy season the fall of water damaged the pavement, and was a source of annoyance to passers by, the Muncipal Board required the plaintiff to change the shape of his gargoyles or replace them by continuous pipes leading from the roof to the pavement below. The plaintiff objected and lost his suit in the lower court. In appeal the Subordinate Judge accepted the suggestion made by the plaintiff's pleader that the water should be conveyed "by the use of round hollow curved iron tubes fixed to the border of the terrace so large as to reach a yard and half below it." It is difficult to see wherein this decision differed materially from the order of the Municipal Board which the plaintiff considered so objectionable: but the Court embodying this suggestion in its judgment reversed the order of the Lower Court and gave plaintiff a decree. At the same time each party was directed to pay his own costs. Under the circumstances the Board acted very wisely in not lodging an appeal to the High Court.

The percentage of appeals decided in favour of municipalities is 85 as against 71 of the year preceding.

In Oudh there was only one appeal, and it was decided in favour of the Municipal Board of Gonda. The percentage therefore is 100; there were no appeals last year.

III.—Suits brought by or against Municipal Boards in Superior Courts of Appeal.—In three cases Municipal Boards were cited as respondents before the High Court, and all three appeals were won. There was no special appeal in Oudh. The percentage in North-Western Provinces is 100; no special appeals were decided last year.

To tabulate the above results for facility of reference:—

Courts.	Municipal Board plaintiff or appellant.	Municipal Board defendant or respondent.	Total.	For the Municipal Board.	Against the Municipal Board.	Pending.	Percentage in favour of the Municipal Board.
N.-W. P.							
Courts of first Instance	26	25	51	16	11	22	59·
District Courts in appeal	2	7	9	6	1	2	85·
Highest Courts of appeal	...	3	3	3	...	...	100·
Total	28	35	63	25	12	24	67·
Oudh.							
Courts of First Instance	1	2	3	1	1	1	50·
District Courts in appeal	...	1	1	1	...	...	100·
Total	1	3	4	2	1	1	66·

IV.—Realization of sums decreed due to Municipal Boards.—Out of Rs. 230 awarded during the year on account of claims only Rs. 13-1-6 or little above 5 per cent. has been recovered. There is only one large sum outstanding and this is due to the Municipal Board of Cawnpore. No explanation is given as to the reason of non-recovery; but from the fact that Rs. 14-4-6 were spent in suing out execution of the decree the Municipal Board would appear not to have overlooked the claim.

Under costs Rs. 113-3-3 have been recovered out of Rs. 179-7-3 or 63 per cent. as against 21 per cent. in the preceding year. The sums left outstanding are all small items. As regards claims outstanding Rs. 61-5-10 have been recovered out of Rs. 2,968-10-10 or 2 per cent.

None of the interest outstanding was recovered ; and only Rs. 108-5-10 out of Rs. 882-15-11 due on account of costs have been recovered, being 12 per cent.

The whole of the balance due on account of claims and costs is virtually covered by two decrees which in themselves amount to 69 per cent. of the outstandings for the year. These are—

		Rs.	a.	p.
1.	Due from Mr. E. Martin to Municipal Board, Roorkee ...	811	2	0
2.	Due from Lala Jagan Prasad to Municipal Board, Allahabad ...	3,282	7	9

Mr. Martin applied to be declared insolvent, but as he is said to have some title to property in the future, the claim has not been struck off. The decree against Lala Jagan Prasad remained unrealized of set purpose more or less. The Municipality were considering the question of remitting a certain portion of it, and it has since been adjusted by remission of part and realization of the balance in full.

In Oudh Rs. 7-15-3 were decreed during the year ; the whole of this was realized. Of the outstanding Rs. 41 the recovery has been Rs. 2-1-3. The balance is due from one debtor in Fyzabad, and the Deputy Commissioner is doing his best to recover it.

V.—Amount expended in litigation.—In Statement V. only one item calls for remarks, and that is the sum of Rs. 344 spent by the Municipality of Mussoorie in defending a suit brought against the Board by Mr. Powell. The suit was one to compel the Municipality to cancel an order refusing permission to build a shop on the Mall. The Municipality had refused permission as they considered it highly undesirable in the general interest of the community to allow the mall to become over-built. The case was more or less of a test case and the Municipality considered it advisable that the opinion given by this office should be supplemented by the best professional advice available. They were advised that the suit could be defended with every hope of success, but the Board considered it best to avail themselves of a compromise. The costs incurred by the plaintiff were paid in consideration of the plaintiff having had at first some reason to believe permission would be granted.

C.—COURT OF WARDS.

I.—Suits by or against the Court of Wards of First Instance.—During the year under review the Court of Wards for the North-Western Provinces instituted 59 suits and 30 were instituted against them. Out of the 59 one was compromised, eight still are pending, five were decided against and 45 in favour of the Court. Of the 30, seven are pending, four were compromised, 12 were decided for and 7 against the Court. The result is therefore a percentage of 82 in favour of the Court, against 74 for last year. Each of the cases in which the Court of Wards has been unsuccessful will be considered under the estate immediately concerned. It will be sufficient to say here that of the five cases in which the Court was plaintiff and lost the claim, three never passed through this office, one was instituted against advice to the contrary, and the fifth would have been taken into the Appellate Court, but that the Collector and Commissioner both agreed that it was more expedient for the interest of the estate that the adverse decision should be acquiesced in.

Of the seven cases lost by the Court as defendant, one was conducted without any reference to this office (Estate Sherkot), in another (Estate Sambalhera) the action of the Court in defending the suit was approved and costs allowed, and in a third (Estate Ahmad Hussain Khan) the Collector did his best to bring about an amicable settlement, but failed, as the plaintiff would listen to no overtures. Eventually the Court decreed exactly what the Collector had been prepared to offer from the very first.

In two (Estate Jauli and Estate Fida Hussain) the case was lost through carelessness and delay on the part of the district officials, and in a third (Mashuk Mahal Begam) through want of sufficient evidence to maintain the pleas in defence. In the seventh the Court of Wards was impleaded against its will by the Civil Court.

In Oudh the Court of Wards lost five cases out of one hundred and forty two in which they were plaintiffs, and five cases out of 37 in which they were defendants. From the latter class of cases, three more were withdrawn and four compromised. In addition to these four one of the cases instituted by the Court were also compromised, making a total of five cases compromised during the year As twenty three cases are still pending, the number of cases decided in favour of the Court was only 78. The net result was a percentage of 88 in favour of the Court. The six cases lost by the Court of Wards did not pass through this office. This percentage compares most favourably with that in the North-Western Provinces and shows that very careful attention has been paid to the litigation of the year.

II.—Suit brought by or against the Court of Wards in District Courts of Appeal.—Three appeals were instituted in the North-Western Provinces, of which two are pending and one was decided against the Court. An account of this last case will be found under the heading "District Shâhjahânpur, Estate Fakhr-ud-din Khan." Five appeals were filed against the Court; three are still pending; two were decided for the Court. The result is a percentage of 66 in favour of the Court as against 70 of the last year. In Oudh, out of seven appeals filed by the Court, one was decided in its favour and three against it.* Out of 18, in which the Court of Wards had to appear as respondents, 13 were decided in favour and two against the Court.† The net result is a percentage of 73 in favour of the Court. The five cases lost did not pass through this office.

III.—Suits brought by or against the Court of Wards in superior Court of Appeal.—Two appeals were filed before the High Court, North-Western Provinces, on behalf of the Anapur estate. One was compromised and one is still pending. Out of six taken into the same Court against the Court of Wards four are pending; a fifth was remanded for further trial and is pending; and one was decided in favour of the Court. The result is a percentage of 100 against 83 of last year.

In Oudh the Court of Wards lodged five appeals before the Judicial Commissioner and won three out of the four in which judgment has yet been pronounced. Three were brought against the Court and all three were successfully defended. The result is a percentage of 87 in favor of the Court.

One case went before the Privy Council and this also was decided in favour of the Court.

I now propose to examine the litigation connected with each estate in detail.

District Muzaffarnagar, Estate Sambhalhera.—Two fresh suits have been brought during the year against the Court of Wards, and both of them were based upon promissory notes, alleged to have been executed by Amir Husain who died in May, 1882, leaving a widow, Haidri Begam, two sons, and a daughter. The children being minors, and the mother having been declared a disqualified proprietor by Government in July, 1882, the whole estate has come under the Court of Wards. One of the suits filed by Makhan Lal was for 64 rupees, the second by Karim Husain for Rs. 2,054-8-0; in both cases the Collector felt great doubt as to the genuine nature of the promissory notes; but it was thought advisable in the interests of the estate to put the plaintiffs to strict proof of them. In the second case more especially was there room for great doubt, as advantage had been taken of the death of Amir Hasan to get his widow to execute a fresh promissory note in lieu of the original document said to have been given by Amir Hasan in the February previous. The fresh note was dated just three days after Amir Hasan's death. Musammat Haidri Begam, however, and the family joined in deposing that the document was a genuine one. At the same time the costs incurred by the Court were given in favour of the Court which thus secured a nominal victory, and showed that the Munsiff considered the action taken by the Court in deciding the suit good and proper. The plaintiff has not appealed from the decision. In the case brought by Makhan Lal the note was pronounced genuine by the

*Estate Sambhalhera—(1) Makhan Lal, (2) Karim Husain, *versus* Court of Wards.

* Two appeals still pending.
† Three still pending.

Munsiff. A third and similar claim for Rs. 8,395, brought by Jaidyal, had been pending from the previous year. As Musammat Haidri Begam was prepared to allow this promissory note to be genuine, it too was compromised and the claim paid in full.

There were three suits which were founded on promissory notes given by Wazir Hasan, a brother of Amir Hasan, in favour of one Narotum Das. All three notes, however, were found to have been executed by Wazir Hasan while a minor under the guardianship of the Court of Wards, and the claims brought were accordingly thrown out. Narotam Das fought the cases in regular appeal last year and was defeated. This year special appeals were filed by him in the High Court, and an attempt was made to evade the vigilance of the Collector by not making the Court of Wards a party to the suit. This was defeated and the Collector has obtained permission to appear.

There remain two heavy cases which have been pending now for some time. They are suits brought by Hussaini Begam, daughter of Jamayat Ali, grandfather of the Amir Hasan an Wazir Hassan already mentioned. Each lady sued for $\frac{7}{40}$ths of the estate as her share by inheritance. In each case limitation was set up, as the ladies appeared not to have enjoyed any share of the profits of the estate for many years back. In the original Court the plea of limitation proved successful, and the suits were decided against the ladies on the 16th of September, 1882. Musammat Hussaini Begam filed an appeal in the High Court and succeeded in having the decree set aside, and the case returned for a fresh trial, as the Hon'ble Judges held that sufficient proof had not been given to show whether the possession of the brother who had managed the estate was adverse or the possession of a trustee. Musammat Hussani Begam apparently acquiesced in the decree against her, but on the 17th of July last she filed a petition of appeal which is still pending, and asked to have her case reopened.

In statement IV none of the outstandings due against this estate have been realized, but as the suits in which they were decreed were all under appeal, it would not have been easy to take action. The Rs. 7,471 in column 5 of statement V represents the sums paid in the cases brought by Kazim Husain and Jaidayal.

District Muzaffárnagar, Estate Jauli.—One case brought by Bhagwan Das against the Jauli Estate for Rs. 256-10-0 was based upon a promissory note. In this case the note in question purported to have been given on behalf of a *pardah nashín* lady, Musammat Akbari Begam. This lady had repudiated the note, and yet upon being examined by Commission from the Civil Court admitted it as genuine. A decree was at once passed; and, owing to unpardonable carelessness, if not worse, on the part of both the Revenue Sarishtadar and the local Government Pleader, the Collector was not informed of the decision until the period of appeal had passed. The fees due were withheld from the Government Pleader, and, with a view to prevent a recurrence of such carelessness, I have issued a circular requiring Government Pleaders to report at once to this office every case in which a decree is passed against Government.

The moneys decreed due to the Jauli Estate were not so decreed until the 24th of September, and it was therefore impossible to realize them during the year.

The sum of Rs. 506-5-9, shown in column 5 of statement V, is composed of moneys paid in Bhagwan Dass's case and in a suit decided last year.

District Meerut, Estate Ramsaran Dass.—The litigation here has been very successful; the cases were all claims for moneys lent. Of the Rs. 1,342* shown as realized, Rs. 477 are on account of sums decreed during the year, and the balance on account of sums outstanding. This balance is composed of small sums, and the Collector has more than once attempted to realize it.

District Meerut, Estate Karam Ali Khan.—There is nothing particular to notice here. The one suit brought was decided in favour of the estate and the sum decreed realized.

*Appendix C. Statement IV. columns 13, 14, and 15.

District Bulandshahr, Estate Skinner.—This is perhaps the most important case which has been lost by the Court of Wards in the year under review. The claim was based upon a bond executed on the 2nd July, 1870, by Mr. Thomas Brown Skinner, of Bilaspur. In this bond, which was for Rs. 10,000, bearing interest at 2 per cent. per mensem, a fifteen-biswa right in mauza Til Begampur was hypothecated to the plaintiffs.

The bond was not produced in Court, and was said to have been lost. The Collector's main defence was that after the execution of this bond, and an adjustment of the entire account of the plaintiff, Mr. Brown Skinner, on the 13th of June, 1871, had executed a bond in full settlement of the plaintiff's cash and grain account. The whole contents of this document showed that, with the exception of a debt of Rs. 8,000 secured by a bond, dated 15th March, 1871, there existed no prior debt on the date of the said bond.

The defence was undertaken by the Board of Revenue on the opinion of the Senior Government Pleader, who considered the case a very clear one, and the claim preposterous. The Subordinate Judge of Meerut found on the evidence that the moneys secured by the bond sued upon had been included in the subsequent bond of the 13th June, 1871, and dismissed the claim as one wholly void of fairness. The plaintiff appealed to the High Court, and the defence of the appeal was entrusted by the Board of Revenue to the Senior Government Pleader.

The appeal which had been filed on the 17th day of August, 1883, was decided in December, 1884. The judgment delivered by the High Court is simply as follows :—

"Appeal decreed. Judgment that account with costs be recovered against the property mortgaged as against T. B. Skinner. No decree as to costs against the defendant."

The succinct form in which the judgment has been pronounced prevents my being able to explain how a case, which seemed to the Board of Revenue and the Senior Government Pleader so simple and clear, was eventually lost. The Government Pleader, on being asked for an explanation, replied that on the facts the High Court came to an opposite conclusion from the Court below, and were of opinion that the bond of 1871 did not include the moneys secured by the prior bond of March, 1870.

Statement No. IV. shows Rs. 759 as having to be remitted. These were the costs decreed to the Court of Wards by the Lower Court. In consequence of the appeal these costs had to be remitted. The heavy item, Rs. 1,102-8-0 against Bulandshahr in Statement V represents the costs the estate had to pay for defending the suit above mentioned.

District Muttra, Estate Din Dayal.—The only point for comment here is that the large outstandings due to the estate were handed over with the estate to the proprietor who had come of age. Each year some portion was realized, and in the year under review Rs. 600 had been recovered before the estate was made over. The whole amount is shown as realized in columns 13, 14, and 15, of Statement IV* while in Statement V, column 4, the actual amount recovered (Rs. 599) has alone been entered.

District Agra, Estate Parna.—This suit never reached the Legal Remembrancer's office until it had been decided against the estate in the Lower Court. The property claimed was a house situate in a hamlet called Birj. The Court found that the hamlet and the place where the house had been built was in the midst of ravines, and concluded that special powers had been given the defendants over the land with a view to attract and locate tenants. It was certain that this very house had been the subject of dispute in 1852, and in that year the present defendants had succeeded in asserting their right to the land on which it was built. It is true the estate had been no party to that suit, but looking to possession and this decree the plaint was not happily framed when it proceeded, as it did, upon the lines that adverse possession of the land had never been asserted by defendants. It is possible that a claim proceeding upon the superior right of landlord might have been successful. As it was, however, there appeared

*Appendix C. Statement IV.

no ground for pressing an appeal, and the case was allowed to drop under advice from this office.

District Farukhabad, Estate Khimsipur.—Only one case, and that pending. The recoveries against outstandings are very satisfactory. Out of a total outstanding of Rs. 385, Rs. 310 have been realized.*

Mainpuri, Estate Karauli.—No litigation. The recoveries are excellent, only Rs. 3-5-6 being left out of an outstanding balance of Rs 676-11-6.* The sums shown in return V. were expended in executing the decree. Out of them Rs. 19-2-0 have been recovered.

Mainpuri, Estate Arjunpur.—No litigation. The Collector of Mainpuri still hopes to recover the outstandings due to this estate. The Rs. 24-4-0, shown in form V., have been expended in these attempts to recover, and have been added by the Munsiff as costs to the original decree.

District Etáwah, Estate Bhare.—No litigation. The Rs. 8-11-0 shown in form V. were expended in connection with a heavy suit—Kunwar Rup Sinha *versus* Court of Wards. See L. R. Report, 1883-84, page 4, para. 25.

District Etáwah, Estate Chakarnagar.—Only one suit to recover damages on account of an alleged tort. The sum really due was paid in under advice of this office, and the exorbitant demands made by plaintiff, who refused to accept compensation tendered, were eventually dismissed. The costs awarded have been duly realized.

District Bijnor, Estate Sherkote.—The litigation this year consisted principally of claims to recover money due on bonds. The one suit which was lost was a suit to recover certain cesses. It did not pass through the Legal Remembrancer's office. The recoveries of sums due to this and to the Sahanpur estate are far from satisfactory. Out of the sums decreed during the year, which amounted to Rs 560,* only Rs. 29 have been recovered after an expenditure of Rs. 119 in suing out the various claims.† The Collector's attention has been drawn to the decrees that still remain unrealized. He is of opinion that the majority of the balances is simply irrecoverable, and has entered into communication with Board with a view to the sums being written off. A difference will be found between the outstandings shown this year and the last. The explanation is that last year's returns were not as correct as the present, which have been compiled after careful comparison of the English files with the register of suits kept up by the Ahlmad in charge.

District Bijnor, Estate Sahanpur.—No litigation. As regards recoveries, see remarks under estate Sherkote. The large sum shown in column 5† is on account of the decree given against the estate last year.

District Bijnor, Estate Tilakpur.—No litigation. The sum of Rs. 2,070† completes the payment of three decrees given against the estate in previous years.

District Bijnor, Estate Mansurpur.—No litigation. The sum of Rs. 24-15-2† has been paid on account of a decree passed in the previous year.

District Moradabad, Estate Bishambarnath.—Out of five cases contested during the year, most of which were for bond debts, only one has been lost, and to this the Court of Wards was made a party against their will by the Judge of Moradabad.

The suit lost was a dispute about a plot of ground upon which two zamindárs had given permission to the plaintiff to build a house. The Court of Wards was impleaded as representing co-sharers in the village, but they had studiously refrained from intermeddling, as the estate of which they had superintendence was quite distinct, and whether permission was given or withheld was a matter of complete indifference. As the matter was such a trifling one, it was not thought worth while to dispute in appeal the adverse decision into which the Court had been drawn by the Judge. The recoveries

* See appendix C. Statement IV.

† See appendix C. Statement V. col. 5.

under this estate are very poor, only Rs. 60 having been recovered out of decrees for Rs. 1,521.* Some 13 rupees more of outstandings have also been got in. The main portion of the balance arises out of bonds and decrees made over to the estate in return for debts due by debtors who cannot pay. The Collector certifies that proceedings are pending for recovery of the balances.

District Moradabad, Estate Kunjbehari Lal.—The litigation here is also connected with recovery of bond debts. Decrees have been obtained, but so late in the year that unless the judgment-debtor paid at once, realization would have been impossible because of the civil holidays. The sums spent in prosecution of suits under Statement V. appear large, but Rs. 433-2-3 but of it have already been decreed to the estate, and if the cases now pending are successful there is reasonable hope that the whole will be adjudged due.

District Moradabad, Estate Bhim Singh.—No litigation. All sums outstanding have been recovered.

District Moradabad, Estate Budhprakash.—No litigation. Recoveries satisfactory. Whatever balance is outstanding is being realized by annual instalments.

District Moradabad, Estate Munawar Ali Khan.—No litigation. Recoveries poor. The Collector certifies that execution proceedings have been taken in the Civil Court.

District Moradabad, Estate Kazi Muhammad Abbas.—There has been one case connected with recovery of property during the year. The whole of the outstandings, with the exception of Re. 1-2-0, have been recovered.

District Moradabad, Estate Suraj Narayan.—One suit filed in the year for recovery of a bond debt; one miscellaneous application connected with execution proceedings; both were decided in favour of the estate. All outstandings, with the exception of Re. 1-2-0, have been recovered. The amount shown in Statement V. as expended in defence of suits appears heavy, but most of it is due to a suit for the recovery of Rs. 2,751 which is still pending.

District Budaun, Estate Ahmad Hussain Khan.—The litigation here has been very successful; only one claim for Rs. 80* having been lost out of twenty suits. All these claims were for the recovery of bond debts. The one suit which was lost did not pass through this office, and no explanation has been given. There was one further suit brought by Musammat Ahmadi Begam,† with a view to obtain possession of certain shares to which she considered herself entitled in the property held by the Court of Wards in trust for her brother's children. The Senior Government Pleader was strongly of opinion that the suit should be amicably settled, and my predecessor does not appear to have combated that opinion. The reason for defending the suit was that the lady and her advisers resisted all attempts made to bring about an amicable settlement of the dispute. The lady succeeded in recovering five-eighths of the property claimed by her, and the judgment was at once accepted, as there was no doubt of the justice of the decision. The recoveries are miserably poor and account only for Rs. 116 of the sums decreed during the year*—a sum which does not nearly cover the moneys expended in prosecuting the claims. Some 30 rupees more were realized out of the outstandings of the previous years. No explanation is given why execution of decrees has not been more vigorously taken out than it has been. The Collector's attention was called to the large sums outstanding, and he has been again asked to impress upon the Government Pleader the neccessity for personal exertion in this matter.

* Court of Wards *versus* Sukhi.

† Musammat Ahmadi Begam *versus* Court of Wards.

District Moradabad, Estate Chintamani.—This was a suit to recover money due on a bond. It was undertaken against the advice of this office and the order of the Board under a misapprehension by the Collector. Fortunately the loss is not a very serious one, the

Court of Wards *versus* Pulandar Singh.

*Appendix C., Statement IV.

defendant having contested only a demand for compound interest. The sum due under the bond with simple interest had been paid by the defendant. All the outstandings due to this estate have been recovered.

District Bareilly, Estate Mashuk Mahal Begam.—Out of six cases the estate has lost only one, a small case for Rs. 14-6-0, a claim for pay brought by a peon against the estate. The Collector admitted in his defence that the sum was due, but pleaded that it had been set off against debts due to the estate by the man at the time of his dismissal. The Munsiff found on the evidence that there was not sufficient proof of the sum said to be due from the peon and decreed the claim. The Board of Revenue were satisfied with the decision and no appeal was preferred. Four more cases were in appeal, two of them for very heavy sums. One has since been compromised, and an account of it has been given by anticipation in last year's report (see pages 6, 7, paras. 37 and 44). The estate has now been released, and these cases will disappear in future from this report. There are no outstandings, and the sums decreed during the year have been fully realized. The heavy costs entered in column 6, form V, were incurred in defending the appeals mentioned above.

District Bareilly, Estate Durga Parshad.—No litigation. All sums outstanding have been recovered.

District Shâhjahânpur, Estate Fakhar-ud-din Khan.—In this estate the returns show that one suit was lost in appeal. The case in question was a peculiar one; the Court of Wards had sued one Mahtab Kuar to enforce redemption of an estate mortgaged to her, and at the same time asked for mesne profits. This suit was decreed in favour of the Court, but not until it had been carried up to the High Court. The High Court found a sum of Rs. 119-2-0 due from the Court of Wards to the mortgagee over and above the sums decreed by the Lower Courts in her favour. While this appeal was pending a year intervened between the date of the original decree and the Court's recovery of possession, and the Collector claimed mesne profits for this year. As this claim was also resisted the Collector was driven into Court to recover these profits. The Munsiff awarded the mesne profits, but refused a decree for costs. It was on this question of costs that the appeal lost was filed; the appellate Court agreed with the Munsiff in refusing costs on the grounds that as the sum of Rs. 1,192 was not paid till after the mesne profits sued for had accrued, the profits should have been deducted from the Rs. 1,192 at the time of payment without the intervention of a civil suit. The recoveries of sums outstanding are very good.

District Shâhjahânpur, Estate Narayanpur.—Only one suit to recover a bond debt. The sums outstanding from last year have been realized, but not those decreed during the year. The Collector reports that execution proceedings are being taken.

District Shâhjahânpur, Estate Powayan.—Four suits during the year for the recovery of bond debts; all decreed in favor of the estate. The sums outstanding are large and recoveries poor—only Rs. 31-1-0 having been got in of the sums decreed during the year. The Collector is however recovering all outstanding balances in driblets, and probably this is the only safe method.

District Shâhjahânpur, Estate Kakra.—No litigation. Outstandings have not been recovered, but the Collector says search is being made for the judgment-debtor's property.

District Cawnpore, Estate Ratanpur.—Four cases during the year for possession of real property; two have been decided in favour of the estate, and two are pending. No explanation has been given why sums awarded during the year have not been recovered.

District Cawnpore, Estate Rawatpur.—Only one suit has been instituted to recover damages on account of an alleged tort. It is still pending.

District Fatehpur, Estate Basharat Husain.—Only one suit against the estate to recover possession of land. It was dismissed. Recoveries on account of outstandings

are poor, and the recovery of any further balance seems problematical, as the Collector reports the judgment-debtors are poor cultivators.

District Fatehpur, Estate Balwant Rao.—Only one case which was instituted to enforce the right of irrigation from a tank. The case was compromised without reference to this office, but it is doubtful whether any other course than that adopted by the Collector would have been attended with advantage. There are no outstandings.

District Bánda, Estate Ganesh Singh.—No litigation. There is a small balance of Rs. 12 outstanding which the Collector reports as recoverable.

District Allahabad, Estate Jangbahadur—One petty case was instituted during the year for the recovery of property, and the claim was decreed. The costs awarded were paid at once. There are no outstandings.

District Allahabad, Estate Partabchand.—There were four cases connected with rights of property and one appeal of the same description. In one case a decree has been recovered and the rest are pending. The recoveries of this estate appear very poor; but the heavy outstandings are in reality due to a decree for Rs. 37,560-8-4, passed against Madho Parshad Sadullah, and others.* Rs. 4,634-8-7 were realized during the year, and the Collector reports that he hopes to realize the remainder by bringing to auction more of the judgment-debtor's property.

District Allahabad, Gauri Parshad Singh.—One petty case during the year connected with rights of property. The outstandings here are large in comparison with the amounts realized, but the sum decreed is being, and can only be, recovered in small driblets.

District Jaunpur, Estate Dube.—Four suits during the year, the most important being for the recovery of Rs. 1,200 due on a bond. This case and another connected with rights to property were decreed in favour of the Court. One claim was laid for the demolition of a house built by a tenant on land leased to him for agricultural purposes. The Munsiff found that the house was an old one, and not one, as the Collector had advised this office, newly built. The Commissioner and the Board agreed that to appeal was not expedient, as "a tenant should be encouraged to build near his field." A second case was decided against the estate. I am unable to say why, as the judgment and decree never appear to have reached this office. It was a petty claim for possession of a small quantity of land.

Court of Wards *versus* Maul Shukul.

Rai Randhir Singh *versus* Court of Wards.

Recoveries are very small. The Collector reports that he is doing his best to recover the amounts awarded to the estate.

District Jaunpur, Estate Sarai Mir.—No litigation. Recoveries here, too, are very poor. The Collector's attention has been drawn to them, and he reports that he is doing his best to ascertain whether the judgment-debtor has any property from which realization could be effected.

District Mirzapur, Estate Barhar.—No litigation. Sums outstanding have been realized.

District Gházipur, Estate Anapur.—One heavy case has been instituted to recover Rs. 1,00,000 from the Manager of the estate. There were three other claims connected with rights to real property, two of which have been decreed in favour of the Court and one is still pending. There is also an appeal of the same class pending before the High Court. The recoveries on account of outstandings are poor; but the Collector is of opinion that they can be got by small instalments.

District Gorakhpur, Estate Chaumukha.—None of the sums awarded during the year have been recovered; but the recoveries under outstandings are good.

Prag Dat *versus* Court of Wards.

*Appendix C., Statement IV.

District Gorakhpur, Estate Majhauli.—There have been two cases during the year—one for the recovery of a bond debt and the other connected with rights to real property. Both have been decreed in favour of the Court; but the latter has been appealed, and the appeal is pending. The balances of the year are large, but they are due to the fact that the decree awarding the moneys was not passed till the 16th of September or just as the year was closing. The recoveries on account of outstandings are good.

District Gorakhpur, Estate Damri.—No litigation. All outstandings have been recovered.

District Gorakhpur, Estate Bansgaon.—No litigation and no recoveries during the year. The Collector still reports the balance has been recoverable.

District Basti, Estate Mithwal.—Only one case for the recovery of a debt alleged to be due from the estate. The case was dismissed: no outstandings.

District Basti, Estate Fida Husain.—No outstandings. One case has been lost; the claim being a good one was not opposed, and had the Collector tendered payment when notice was first served, the minor estate would have been saved the burden of costs.

District Ballia, Estate Sunwani.—The balances here were pending in consequence of the case to which they referred being in appeal before the High Court. The decree was not obtained in time before the year closed to allow of proceedings being taken in execution. The heavy expenses shown in column 5 of Statement V. were also connected with the same suit.

As by far the majority of cases connected with the Court of Wards in Oudh did not pass through this office, and was successfully conducted, I have not attempted to pass the litigation of the several districts in review.

IV. The figures in Statement IV. have already been brought under review in the preceding pages. It will be found that in the North-Western Provinces the realizations this year have been 34 per cent. of the whole outstandings. Out of the balance 12 per cent. has been pronounced by the Board of Revenue to be past recovery.

In Oudh the recoveries have been better and amount to 53 per cent. of the outstandings, and 2 per cent. more have been written off as irrecoverable.

The difficulty here has been, as in Government and Municipal suits, to ensure recovery of sums decreed in past years, and by far the larger part of the present balances consists of moneys awarded in the years preceding that under review.

V.—The total receipts in the North-Western Provinces have been Rs. 14,825-8-8 and the expenditure Rs. 29,669-14-5. Under the receipts no account has been taken of the debts* due to the Din Dayal estate (see page 12) and smaller sums due to other estates also released during the year under review. This will explain the discrepancy between the total sums shown as realized in Statement IV. and those shown as receipts under Statement V. The items which contribute most to the heavy disbursements set out in this statement are (1) the sum of Rs. 771-0-5, decreed against the Sambhalhera estate, and (2) the sum of Rs. 11,661-9-6, expended in defending the appeals under the estate Mashuk Mahal Begam.

* Rs. 20,946-15-6.

In Oudh the receipts appear as Rs. 15,466-12-1 against an expenditure of Rs. 13,317-8-8. The heaviest item here is that of Rs. 9,916-2-5, most of which was incurred in the appeal preferred to the Privy Council. Most of this will in time be recovered, so that litigation in Oudh has not been attended with as much loss as in the sister province.

D.—GENERAL.

Appendix C. shows that of a total of 421 suits instituted during the year by all three departments, only 55 were unsuccessful. One hundred and sixty of the cases

were for the recovery of money or property due under contracts, one hundred and fifty three for the declaration of right to or possession of property and thirty one to set aside acts or orders passed by officers of Government.

E.—RECOVERIES OF GOVERNMENT DUES IN PAUPER SUITS.

In the North-Western Provinces there were Rs. 20,149 outstanding and Rs. 24,633 awarded during the year under report. Out of these sums Rs. 7,829 were recovered, being a percentage of 17 per cent. as against 20 per cent. in the previous year.

In Oudh Rs. 2,136 are outstanding and Rs. 4,375 awarded during the year. Out of this sum Rs. 3,085 has been recovered, being a percentage of 47 per cent. as against 44 per cent. in the preceding year.

The direct control over these recoveries has always rested with the Commissioners of Divisions. The only remarks forwarded to me have come from the following officers :—

The Commissioner of Allahabad writes to the effect that he "has satisfied himself that proper measures have been taken for realizing the balances as expeditiously as possible."

The Commissioner of Benares writes :—"The outstandings in Benares, Mirzapur and Gorakhpur being heavy, to enable him to supervise the working of this department, the Commissioner has called for the submission of monthly progress reports with a note of measures taken in all pending cases."

I have the honor to be,
SIR,
Your most obedient servant,
G. E. KNOX,
Acting Legal Remembrancer to Govt., N.-W. P. & Oudh.

APPENDIX.

BABU RAM UGRAH SINGH AND OTHERS, *versus* SECRETARY OF STATE.

THIS suit was instituted on the 26th of February, 1880. The claim was for a decree by the Civil Courts that certain lands, which the revenue authorities held to be alluvial increments to the taluka of Karauni, should be declared to be part of the area in respect of which the permanent settlement was made and in accordance therewith exempt from assessment.

The defence put forward by the Board of Revenue on behalf of the Secretary of State was, that the lands in dispute were not in existence at the time of the permanent settlement, but had accrued subsequently, or that, if in existence, they then appertained to a mahál in the Saran district.

That in 1800 or subsequently by a chance in the main stream of the Gogra the lands were transferred as accretions to the taluka of the plaintiffs and became liable to assessment.

The Lower Court found on the 28th of April, 1881, that the lands in dispute formed part of the area which was permanently-settled with the ancestors of the plaintiffs, and further considered that the plaintiff had established a right to hold the lands free from assessment for revenue.

It further held that there was no law which precluded a Civil Court from entertaining a claim to contest the right of Government to collect revenue from any zamindar in excess of the amount sanctioned by Government, or to fix a new enhanced demand on maháls settled for a term before that term expired or in permanently-settled maháls.

The Board, acting upon advice given by the Collector of Ballia and the Senior Government Pleader, appealed from this decree both on questions of fact and of law.

The more important pleas taken in this appeal were—

1. That it was not proved that the land in dispute formed part of the area of taluka Karauni settled with the plaintiff's ancestors.

2. That the plaintiffs could not obtain a right to hold the land free from assessment to revenue by long possession.

3. That the Civil Court had no power to question or set aside settlements of land or assessments of revenue.

The appeal was heard by Oldfield and Mahmud, J.J., who decided on the question of fact in favour of the plaintiffs on the ground that they had shown that they were in possession of these same lands in 1803, claiming them on the same title as now; that they successfully asserted that title in 1803 to 1814 against the zamindars of Basantpur; that they had renewed leases given to them in 1806 by Government on the same terms as the original leases without alteration notwithstanding that they were in possession of the disputed lands; that they again successfully resisted an attempt in 1816 to 1818 to have these lands assessed setting up the same title, when the Government with a knowledge of the facts appears to have deliberately refused to assess the lands, holding them not liable to be assessed as they formed part of a permanently-settled area, and lastly on the ground that Government after the passing of Regulation I. of 1819 never asserted any right to assess the lands and abstained deliberately from doing so when revision of settlement was proceeding in 1839 to 1841.

On the question of law the learned Judge found—

(1) That length of possession of these lands free from revenue would not give plaintiffs a title to hold them free from assessment with revenue.

(2) That the jurisdiction of the Civil Court to question or set aside settlement of land did not arise as the suit was one for alleged wrongful acts of the revenue officers in violation of rights conferred on the plaintiff by the legislature.

The appeal was dismissed with costs, and on the advice of my predecessor this decision was accepted.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, Court, of First Instance between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	State Plaintiff.									State Defendant.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of claims pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
			Rs a. p.					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a p.					Rs a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Dehra Dún	1	158 13 0	1	...	...	...	158 13 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Saharanpur	1	371 14 7	1	...	...	...	371 14 7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut	1	525 10 0	1	...	...	...	525 10 0	...	...	3	3,968 13 5	1	...	1	1	...	...	...
AGRA	Muttra	2	187 6 11	2	...	...	...	187 6 11	...	...	2	627 9 10	1	...	...	...	...	1	502 9 10
	Agra	1	52 8 0	1	...	...	...	52 8 0	...	...	1	915 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Farukhabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	371 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	371 0 0
	Etah	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	249 8 9	1	...	...	...	...	...	..
	Mainpuri	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	299 15 0	1	...	1	...	169 12 8	...	...
ROHILKHAND	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	408 0 0	1	1	..	...	400 0 0	1	4 0 0
	Bareilly	1	671 0 0	..	...	...	1	671 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Pilibhit	2	132 3 6	2	...	...	...	132 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0
	Allahabad	3	27 235 14 4	2	...	...	...	497 8 0	1	26,738 6 4	1	3,668 11 9	...	...	...	...	...	1	3,668 11 0
BENARES	Mirzapur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	94 5 0	1	...	...	..	...	...	...
	Benares	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	10,817 10 3	2	...	1	...	...	2	4,878 0 0
	Ghazipur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	6,485 0 5	2	..	...	...	...	3	5,030 6 0
	Gorakhpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	2	1,038 0 0	...	2	...	...	237 1 6	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	12	29,335 6 4	10	...	...	1	2,597 0 0	1	26,738 6 4	28	28,963 9 8	11	3	3	1	806 13 6	10	14,474 10 10
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	7	1,351 5 1	5	...	...	...	1,280 5 10	2	70 15 3	3	145 0 0	1	2	...	...	70 0 0	...	...
SITAPUR	Hardoi	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	62 0 0	...	1	...	...	50 0 0	...	...
	Kheri	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	360 8 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD	Fyzabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9	312 0 0	5	3	...	...	135 0 0	1	130 0 0
RAE BARELI	Rae Bareli	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	285 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	285 0 0
	Total, Oudh	7	1,351 5 1	5	...	...	...	1,280 5 10	2	70 15 3	16	1,164 8 0	8	6	...	...	255 0 0	2	415 0 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	19	30,686 11 5	15	...	...	1	3,877 5 10	3	26,809 5 7	44	30,128 1 8	19	9	3	1	1,061 13 6	12	14,889 10 10

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, District Courts of appeal between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1886.*

Division.	District.	State Appellant.									State Respondent.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of appeals pending	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of appeals pending	Value of claims pending.
			Rs. a. p.					Rs a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p					Rs a. p.		Rs a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	32,300 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Saharanpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,160 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,160 0 0
	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	525 10 0	1	...	...	...	...	.	...
	Aligarh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	369 6 5	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Mutra	.	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	.	...
	Agra	1	1,379 8 9	1	...	...	...	224 0 0	...	...	1	52 8 0	...	1		...	52 8 0	...	...
	Farukhabad	1	200 0 0	1	...	...	...	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	4 0 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	271 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	271 14 6
BENARES ...	Ghazipur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,430 7 10	...	..	...	...	...	1	1,430 7 10
	Gorakhpur	1	31 10 8	1	...	...	.	...	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	.	...
	Total, N.-W Provinces ...	3	1,611 3 5	3	...	...	...	424 0 0	...	...	8	42,133 14 9	3	1	..	...	52 8 0	4	8,866 6 4
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	2	38 0 0	1	...	...	...	33 0 0	1	5 0 0	2	992 3 3	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
SITAPUR ...	Kheri .. .	...	...	...	...	..	...	..	...	...	1	360 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	2	35 0 0	2	...	...	...	35 0 0	...	...	1	5 0 0	..	..	...	...	...	1	5 0 0
	Total, Oudh ...	4	73 0 0	3	..	...	..	68 0 0	1	5 0 0	4	1,357 3 3	3	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...	7	1,684 3 5	6	...	...	...	492 0 0	1	5 0 0	12	43,491 2 0	6	1	...	...	52 8 0	5	8,871 6 4

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	State Appellant									State Respondent.									Remarks.
		Number for disposal	Value of claims in appeal.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed	No of appeals pending	Value of appeals pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims in appeal.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn	Amount decreed	No of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeal pending.	
			Rs. a. p					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p							Rs a. p	
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dun ...	1	301 10 8	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
AGRA ...	Agra	1	250 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	250 0 0	...	...	...	...	.	...	...	...	..	
	Farukhabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	1	200 0 0	...	...	..	...	...	1	200 0 0	
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,939 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,939 0 0	
ALLAHABAD ...	Bánda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	75 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	981 4 6	...	1	...	...	981 4 6	...	...	
BENARES ...	Balha	1	51,648 6 9	...	1	...	...	51,648 6 9	...	...	1	37,717 12 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	37,717 12 6	
JHÁNSI ...	Jalaun	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	.	...	1	192 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, N W. Provinces...	3	52 200 1 5	...	2	...	...	51,648 6 9	1	250 0 0	7	42,105 1 0	3	1	...	..	981 4 6	3	40,856 12 6	
	OUDH.																			
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	A 18,100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
SITAPUR ...	Kheri	...	...	...		..	...	...	...	...	1	A 2,85,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,85,000 0 0	A Before the Privy Council.
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, Oudh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3,03,150 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	1	...	
	Total, N -W. P and Oudh,	3	52,200 1 5	...	2	...	...	51,648 6 9	1	250 0 0	10	3,45,255 1 0	5	1	...	...	981 4 6	4	3,25,856 12 6	

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV.—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1884-85 *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October*, 1885.

Division.	District.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October, 1884.			Awarded to State between 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885.			Total.			Realized during 1884-85.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún	424 8 0	...	49 4 0	...	...	...	424 8 0	...	49 4 0	...	...	...
	Saháranpur	9,995 12 9	...	977 15 11	371 14 7	...	37 2 0	10,367 11 4	...	1,015 1 11	371 14 7	...	37 2 0
	Meerut	370 8 8	...	...	525 10 0	...	119 14 9	895 2 8	...	119 14 9	525 10 0	...	116 13 9
	Aligarh	575 0 0	188 1 4	60 6 0	...	...	22 0 7	575 0 0	188 1 4	82 6 7	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra	...	...	...	...	...	50 13 6	...	...	50 13 6	...	...	26 14 6
	Agra	...	1 0 0	...	...	...	15 4 0	...	1 0 0	15 4 0	...	...	...
	Farukhabad	...	...	...	...	2 7 6	62 7 0	...	2 7 6	62 7 0	...	...	15 2 0
	Mainpuri	...	...	12 7 0	...	...	0 10 0	...	...	13 1 0	...	...	13 1 0
	Etah	...	...	...	...	...	9 3 6	...	...	9 3 6	...	...	9 3 6
ROHILKHAND	Moradabad	4,774 12 4	873 8 2	1,748 12 11	...	...	266 11 10	4,774 12 4	873 8 2	2,015 8 9	4 14 8	5 2 1	6 1 3
	Bareilly	16,730 10 2	...	1,311 5 6	671 0 0	...	...	17,401 10 2	...	1,311 5 6	671 0 0	...	...
	Fatehpur	60 0 0	1 0 0	13 0 0	...	...	...	60 0 0	1 0 0	13 0 0	...	...	12 7 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Bánda	...	...	28 13 0	...	1 14 6	...	...	1 14 6	28 13 0	...	1 14 6	28 13 0
	Allahabad	814 15 3	162 11 1	379 5 9	275 2 6	61 13 4	13 0 0	1,090 1 9	224 8 5	392 5 9	...	0 8 6	128 4 0
	Mirzapor	...	...	7 10 3	...	...	2 8 0	...	...	10 2 3	...	...	9 2 3
BENARES ...	Benares	242 0 3	...	12 6 0	...	...	38 2 6	242 0 3	...	50 8 6	51 2 0	...	8 14 0
	Basti	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	1,476 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	1,476 3 6	...	...	...
JHÁNSI ...	Jalaun	...	...	31 7 0	...	...	15 2 6	...	...	46 9 6	...	...	40 3 6
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	33,988 3 5	1,276 4 7	6,148 8 10	1,843 11 1	66 3 4	653 0 2	35,831 14 6	1,292 7 11	6,801 9 0	1,624 9 3	7 9 1	450 1 9
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	19,115 13 6	4,063 0 2	1,392 3 0	1,260 10 8	77 0 10	2,528 10 11	20,376 8 2	4,140 1 0	4,020 13 11	1,364 3 6	...	293 5 2
	Bara Banki	2,325 4 4	263 5 9	...	...	106 15 7	...	2,325 4 4	369 5 4	...	680 10 8	369 5 4	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	10 4 9	...	44 10 0	...	...	16 6 0	10 4 9	...	61 0 0	...	...	7 14 0
RAE BAREILI ...	Partabgarh	...	...	...	...	...	17 8 0	...	...	17 8 0	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh	21,451 6 7	4,326 5 11	1,436 13 0	1,260 10 8	183 0 5	2,662 8 11	22,712 1 3	4,509 6 4	4,099 5 11	2,044 14 2	369 5 4	301 3 2
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...	55,439 10 0	5,552 10 6	7,585 5 10	3,104 5 9	249 3 9	3,315 9 1	58,543 15 9	5,801 14 3	10,900 14 11	3,669 7 5	376 14 5	751 4 11

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV.—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year 1884-85, and also the sums outstanding on the 1st of October, 1885*—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net balance.			Analysis of balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún	424 8 0	...	49 4 0	...	...	...	424 8 0	...	49 4 0	...	473 12 0	...
	Sahárunpur	9,995 12 9	...	977 15 11	...	...	...	9,995 12 9	...	977 15 11	10,973 12 8	...	...
	Meerut	370 8 8	...	3 1 0	370 8 8	...	...	...	...	3 1 0	3 1 0	...	...
	Aligarh	575 0 0	188 1 4	82 6 7	...	...	...	756 0 0	188 1 4	82 6 7	845 7 11	...	...
AGRA ...	Mutra	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Agra	...	...	23 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	23 15 0	23 15 0	...	...
	Farukhabad	...	1 0 0	15 4 0	...	1 0 0	15 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mainpuri	...	2 7 6	47 5 0	...	...	...	...	2 7 6	47 5 0	49 12 6	...	...
	Etah	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad	4,769 13 8	868 6 1	2,069 7 6	...	190 12 5	1,099 14 6	4,769 13 8	677 9 8	969 9 0	26 4 3	2,100 10 8	4,230 1 5
	Bareilly	16,730 10 2	...	1,311 5 6	...	...	...	16,730 10 2	...	1,311 5 6	...	13,041 15 8	...
	Fatehpur	60 0 0	1 0 0	0 9 0	60 0 0	1 0 0	0 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Bánda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad	1,090 1 9	223 15 11	264 1 9	...	...	...	1,090 1 9	223 15 11	264 1 9	354 8 7	...	1,223 10 10
	Mirzapur	...	...	1 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1 0 0	1 0 0	...	...
BENARES ...	Benares	190 14 3	...	43 10 6	...	...	...	190 14 3	...	43 10 6	4 0 0	12 6 0	218 2 9
	Basti	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	1,476 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	1,476 3 6	270 0 0	...	1,206 3 6
JHÁNSI ...	Jalaun	...	...	6 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	6 6 0	6 6 0	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	34,207 5 3	1,284 14 0	6,351 7 3	430 8 8	192 12 5	1,155 3 6	33,776 12 7	1,092 2 5	5,196 3 9	12,558 3 11	20,628 12 4	6,978 2 6
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	19,012 4 8	4,140 1 0	3,727 8 9	...	...	...	19,012 4 8	4,140 1 0	3,727 8 9	25,780 3 0	34 7 6	1,065 3 11
	Bara Banki	1,644 9 8	...	...	...	...	...	1,644 9 8	...	...	1,644 9 8	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	10 4 9	...	53 2 0	...	...	...	10 4 9	...	53 2 0	13 7 0	49 15 9	...
RAE BARELI ...	Partabgarh	...	...	17 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	17 8 0	17 8 0	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	20,667 3 1	4,140 1 0	3,798 2 9	...	...	...	20,667 3 1	4,140 1 0	3,798 2 9	27,455 11 8	84 7 3	1,065 3 11
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh...	54,874 8 4	5,424 15 10	10,149 10 0	430 8 8	192 12 5	1,155 3 6	54,443 15 8	5,232 3 5	8,994 6 6	40,013 15 7	20,713 3 7	7,943 6 5

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended in litigation, as contrasted with sums actually realized by the State under decrees of Court between the 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885.*

Division	District	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements. Amount including costs awarded against the State in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits	In defence of suits.	Total.	Remarks.
		Rs. a. p	Rs. a p	Rs a. p	Rs. a p.	Rs a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	...	348 15 8	...	...	348 15 8	
	Saháranpur ...	409 0 7	...	342 5 6	...	342 5 6	
	Meerut ...	642 7 9	...	...	...	...	
	Aligarh ...	...	...	...	22 12 0	22 12 0	
AGRA ..	Muttra ...	26 14 6	...	...	...	...	
	Agra ...	...	77 15 6	56 13 0	200 1 6	332 14 0	
	Farukhabad ..	15 2 0	...	10 6 0	15 15 0	26 5 0	
	Mainpuri ...	13 1 0	57 11 0	...	...	(a)57 11 0	
	Etah ...	9 3 6	...	...	...	...	
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad ..	12 0 0	...	...	...	(a)30 5 0	
	Bareilly ..	671 0 0	...	70 12 0	...	70 12 0	
ALLAHABAD ..	Cawnpore ...	...	525 7 7	...	...	525 7 7	
	Fatehpur ...	12 7 0	...	...	...	...	
	Bánda ...	30 11 6	...	...	...	...	
	Allahabad ...	128 12 6	143 4 3	614 15 4	43 14 6	802 2 1	
BENARES ...	Mirzapur ...	9 2 3	...	...	10 12 3	10 12 3	
	Benares ...	56 0 0	...	...	58 13 6	58 13 6	
	Gházipur ...	...	...	..	15 2 0	15 2 0	
	Gorakhpur .	...	...	...	6 15 0	6 15 0	
	Ballia .	...	...	...	...	(a)554 4 7	
JHÁNSI ...	Jalaun ...	40 3 6	...	...	...	...	
	Total, N-W Provinces,	2,078 2 1	1,153 6 0	1,095 3 10	374 5 9	3,206 9 2	
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	1,057 8 8	...	...	...	(a)192 6 3	
	Bara Banki ...	1,050 0 0	...	...	...	...	
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	7 14 0	...	...	...	...	
RAE BAREILI ...	Rae Bareli ...	...	...	...	3 8 9	3 8 9	
	Total, Oudh ...	2,715 6 8	...	...	3 8 9	195 15 0	
	Total, N-W P and Oudh	4,793 8 9	1 153 6 0	1,095 3 10	377 14 6	3,402 8 2	

(a) No details received.

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before, or finally decided by, Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Municipality	Municipality Plaintiff									Municipality Defendant.								
			No for disposal.	Value of claims	Decided. For	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn	Amount decreed	No of suits pending	Value of claims pending	No for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided For.	Decided Against.	Decided Compromised	Decided Withdrawn	Amount.	No of suits pending	Value of claims pending.
				Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p
MEERUT	Dehra Dún	Mussoorie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
	Meerut	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	.	...	1	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0
	Bulandshahr	Khurja	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	4	108 0 0	...	4	...	...	108 0 0	...	...
AGRA	Muttra	Muttra	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	3	90 0 0	...	2	...	...	25 0 0	1	45 0 0
ROHILKHAND	Moradabad		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	17 8 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bareilly		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	699 12 6	5	1	.	1	20 0 0	1	401 11 6
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore	Cawnpore	1	153 15 0	1	...	...	...	153 15 0	...	...	1	40 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad	Allahabad	2	378 8 2	1	...	...	...	71 9 0	1	302 15 2	1	10 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
BENARES	Benares	Benares	23	5,909 10 5	2	3	..	...	338 9 0	18	2,443 12 11	3	80 0 0	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0	...	1	...	...	5 0 0	...	...
		Total, N.-W. Provinces,	26	6,442 1 7	4	3	...	...	564 1 0	19	2,746 12 1	25	2,250 4 6	12	8	...	2	158 0 0	3	646 11 6
		OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW	Unao	Unao	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	1	24 0 0	1	...	.		...	...	...
	Bara Banki	Nawabganj	1	40 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	40 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD	Gonda	Gonda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
		Total, Oudh	1	40 0 0	...	...	...	...	..	1	40 0 0	2	34 0 0	1	1	...	...	...	...	...
		Grand Total, N.-W. P and Oudh.	27	6,482 1 7	4	3	...	...	564 1 0	20	2,786 12 1	27	2,284 4 6	13	9	...	2	158 0 0	3	646 11 6

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before or originally decided by District Courts of appeal between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipality Appellant.									Municipality Respondent.								
			Number for disposal	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
				Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	20 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Moradabad ...	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	17 8 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
		Amroha	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	30 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	79 5 0	1	1	...	...	49 5 0	...	...
ALLAHABAD...	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	194 1 6	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad ...	Allahabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0
BENARES ...	Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur	1	5 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0	...	...	...		...	...	...	...	...
		Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	2	25 0 0	1	...	...	...	20 0 0	1	5 0 0	7	330 14 6	5	1	...	...	49 5 0	1	10 0 0
		OUDH.																		
FYZABAD ...	Gonda ...	Gonda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
		Total, Oudh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
		Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...	2	25 0 0	1	...	...	...	20 0 0	1	5 0 0	8	340 14 6	6	1	...	...	49 5 0	1	10 0 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which Municipal Boards were parties and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipality Appellant.									Municipality Respondent.										Remarks.
			No. for disposal.	Value of claim in appeal.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of appeals in appeal pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims in appeal.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeal pending.		
					For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.					
													Rs a. p.									
ALLAHABAD ...	Bánda	Bánda ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	77 6 1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...		
	Jaunpur	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	50 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...		
	Total, N.-W. Provinces,	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	127 6 1	3	...	...	...	...	...	...		
	OUDH.																					
	Nil.																					

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV.—*Return showing what portion of the amount decreed in favor of Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1884-85 *and sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October*, 1885.

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Outstanding on the 1st October, 1884.			Awarded in favor of Municipalities between 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885.			Total.			Realized during the year 1884-85.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.
			3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	Roorkee	770 0 0	...	41 2 0	...	...	...	770 0 0	...	41 2 0	...	...	...
		Hardwar ...	...	...	10 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	10 9 0	...	...	...
	Meerut ...	Meerut	40 5 0	...	19 6 3	...	...	15 13 0	40 5 0	...	35 3 3	...	...	9 8 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra	...	...	...	...	...	7 5 0	...	...	7 5 0	...	...	7 5 0
	Etah ...	Kasganj	23 10 0	...	14 6 0	...	...	10 9 3	23 10 0	...	24 15 3	...	...	5 0 0
ROHILKHAND	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	7 0 4	...	...	3 14 6	...	...	10 14 10	...	...	7 0 4
		Amroha	...	...	7 9 0	...	...	5 8 0	...	...	13 1 0	...	...	12 1 6
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly	...	...	1 2 0	...	...	16 11 6	...	...	17 13 6	...	...	5 1 0
ALLAHABAD,	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	8 3 10	158 12 5	...	30 15 6	158 12 5	...	39 3 4	...	...	...
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ...	...	...	17 11 3	...	...	...	-	...	17 11 3	...	...	...
	Bánda ...	Bánda	65 3 10	...	97 15 6	...	...	18 8 6	65 3 10	...	116 8 0	61 5 10	...	116 8 0
	Allahabad ...	Allahabad ...	2,069 8 0	585 14 9	627 1 0	71 9 2	...	28 0 3	2,141 1 2	585 14 9	655 1 3	13 1 6	...	28 0 3
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares	...	...	30 13 9	...	...	42 1 9	...	...	72 15 6	...	...	31 0 9
		Total, N.-W. Provinces,	2,968 10 10	585 14 9	882 15 11	230 5 7	...	179 7 3	3,199 0 5	585 14 9	1,062 7 2	74 7 4	...	221 8 10
		OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Unao ...	Nawabganj ...	...	...	...	...	...	5 0 0	...	...	5 0 0	...	...	5 0 0
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	Fyzabad ...	36 0 0	...	5 0 0	...	...	2 15 3	36 0 0	...	7 15 3	...	...	5 0 6
		Total, Oudh ...	36 0 0	...	5 0 0	...	...	7 15 3	36 0 0	...	12 15 3	...	...	10 0 6
		Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	3,004 10 10	585 14 9	887 15 11	230 5 7	...	187 6 6	3,235 0 5	585 14 9	1,075 6 5	74 7 4	...	231 9 4

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV.—*Return showing what portion of the amount decreed in favour of Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1884-85, *and sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October*, 1885—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Balance.			Remitted.			Balance.			Analysis of Balance.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
15		16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.				Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	Roorkee ...	770 0 0	...	41 2 0	...	...	...	770 0 0	...	41 2 0	...	811 2 0	...
		Hardwár ...	...	...	10 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	10 9 0	10 9 0	...	...
	Meerut ...	Meerut ...	40 5 0	...	25 11 3	...	...	...	40 5 0	...	25 11 3	66 0 3	...	...
AGRA	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Etah ...	Kasganj ...	23 10 0	...	19 15 3	...	...	...	23 10 0	...	19 15 3	43 9 3	...	...
ROHILKHAND.	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	3 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	3 14 6	3 14 6	...	...
		Amroha ...	...	...	0 15 6	...	...	...	...	...	0 15 6	...	0 15 6	...
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly ...	...	...	12 12 6	...	...	...	...	...	12 12 6	9 9 0	3 3 6	...
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	158 12 5	...	39 3 4	...	...	...	158 12 5	...	39 3 4	197 15 9	...	...
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ...	...	...	17 11 3	...	...	...	...	...	17 11 3	17 11 3	...	...
	Banda ...	Bánda ...	3 14 0	...	...	...	...	...	3 14 0	...	...	3 14 0	...	...
	Allahabad ...	Allahabad ...	2,127 15 8	585 14 9	627 1 0	...	...	...	2,127 15 8	585 14 9	627 1 0	58 7 8	3,282 7 9	...
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	...	...	41 14 9	...	...	...	...	...	41 14 9	31 2 9	...	10 12 0
		Total, N.-W. Provinces,	3,124 9 1	585 14 9	840 14 4	...	...	...	3,124 9 1	585 14 9	840 14 4	442 13 5	4,097 12 9	10 12 0
		OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Unao ...	Nawabganj ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	Fyzabad ...	36 0 0	...	2 14 9	...	...	...	36 0 0	...	2 14 9	...	38 14 9	...
		Total, Oudh ...	36 0 0	...	2 14 9	...	...	...	36 0 0	...	2 14 9	...	38 14 9	...
		Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	3,160 9 1	585 14 9	843 13 1	...	...	...	3,160 9 1	585 14 9	843 13 1	442 13 5	4,136 11 6	10 12 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Municipal Board under decrees of Court between the 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements. Amount including costs awarded against Municipalities in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	Total.
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún .	Mussoorie ..	...	...	...	344 0 0	344 0 0
	Saháranpur ...	Hardwár ...	...	...	...	7 4 0	7 4 0
	Meerut ..	Meerut ...	9 8 0	...	...	...	...
	Bulandshahr ...	Khurja ...	..	...	...	42 3 0	42 3 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ..	Muttra .	7 5 0	..	...	12 6 0	12 6 0
	Etah ...	Kasganj ..	5 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	7 0 0
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad ...	Amroha ..	12 1 6	...	...	5 10 0	5 10 0
		Moradabad ...	7 0 4	...	...	17 2 10	17 2 10
	Bareilly	Bareilly ...	5 1 0	...	...	21 5 0	21 5 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ..	Cawnpore ..	...	...	9 4 0	...	9 4 0
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ..	...	...	...	2 6 0	2 6 0
	Bánda ...	Bánda ...	177 13 10	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad .	Allahabad ..	41 1 9	...	33 6 0	10 4 9	43 10 9
BENARES .	Benares ..	Benares ..	31 0 9	...	5 0 0	33 5 0	38 5 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ..		296 0 2	...	54 10 0	495 14 7	550 8 7
LUCKNOW ...	Unao ...	Nawabganj ..	5 0 0	...	..	3 0 6	3 0 4
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ..	Fyzabad ..	5 0 6	...	1 7 9	...	1 7 9
		Total, Oudh ..	10 0 6	...	1 7 9	3 0 6	4 8 3
	Total, N. W P. and Oudh ...		306 0 8	...	56 1 9	498 15 1	555 0 10

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil suits to which Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces, was party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, Courts of first instance between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Court of Wards Estate.	Court of Wards Plaintiff. No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For	Against.	Compromised	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of cases pending.	Value of cases pending	Court of Wards Defendants. No. for disposal	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of cases pending.	Value of claims pending.	Remarks.
				Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.		Rs a. p.					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT	Muzaffarnagar	Sambalhera Estate	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	10,513 8 0	1	1	(a)1	...	64 0 0	...	...	(a).—In this case claim being found justly due was paid by C. W.
		Jauli	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	256 10 0	...	1	...	...	256 10 0	...	...	
	Meerut	Ram Saran Das Estate	8	2,722 9 6	8	...	...	...	2,722 9 6	...	...	1	50 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Karam Ali Khan Estate	1	17 0 0	1	...	...	...	17 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
AGRA	Agra	Parna	1	40 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Farukhabad	Khimsipur	1	21 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	21 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Etáwah	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	48 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor	Sherkote	3	665 13 0	1	1	...	...	378 14 3	1	274 4 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Moradabad	Bishambhar Nath	3	1,256 8 0	2	...	...	...	1,233 8 0	1	25 0 0	2	140 0 0	1	1	...	...	40 0 0	...	...	
		Kazi Muhammad Abas	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Kunj Behari Lal	2	5,911 14 0	1	...	...	...	697 14 7	1	1,928 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Suraj Narayan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,751 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,751 15 0	
	Budaun	Ahmad Husain Khan	20	1,036 7 6	19	1	...	...	956 7 6	...	...	1	1,125 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Chintamani	1	1,562 6 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Bareilly	Maskuk Mahal Begam	2	437 0 3	1	...	...	...	114 13 6	1	322 2 9	4	6,12,131 13 2	1	1	2	...	14 6 0	...	...	
	Shábjahánpur	Pawayan Estate	4	389 11 6	4	...	...	...	389 11 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Narsyanpur	1	90 0 0	1	...	...	...	90 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Fakar ud din Estate	1	407 2 1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Cawnpore	Ratanpur	2	389 0 3	2	...	...	...	389 0 3	...	...	2	26,194 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	16,194 0 0	
		Rawatpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	80 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	80 0 0	
	Fatehpur	Bisharat	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	155 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Balwant Rao	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	49 12 0	...	...	1	...	1 0 0	...	...	
ALLAHABAD	Allahabad	Jang Bahadur	1	8 0 0	1	...	...	...	8 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Partab Chand	2	35 1 9	1	...	...	...	15 6 3	1	119 11 6	2	65 7 6	...	...	...	...	...	2	65 7 6	
		Ganesh Kunwar	1	25 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Jaunpur	Dube	2	1,300 0 0	1	1	...	...	1,200 0 0	...	...	2	250 0 0	1	1	...	...	200 0 0	...	...	
	Gházipur	Anapur	2	11,357 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	11,357 0 0	2	1,079 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	1	99 0 0	
BANARES	Gorakhpur	Chaumukha	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,867 15 6	...	1	...	...	2,867 15 6	...	...	
		Majhauli	1	1,866 2 0	1	...	...	...	1,866 2 0	...	...	1	500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Basti	Mithwal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	64 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Fida Hussain	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	519 0 0	...	1	...	...	519 0 0	...	...	
		N.-W. P. Total	59	29,640 1 10	45	5	1	...	10,079 7 4	8	14,048 1 0	30	6,58,851 1 2	12	7	4	...	3,962 15 6	7	19,190 6 6	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil suits to which the Court of Wards, Oudh, was party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, Courts of first instance between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885*—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Court of Wards Estate.	Court of Wards Plaintiff. No for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of cases pending.	Value of cases pending.	Court of Wards Defendants. No for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of cases pending.	Value of claims pending.	Remarks.
				Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	Itaunja	5	841 2 9	5				841 2 9												
	Bara Banki	Jasmanda	5	60 12 0	5				60 12 0												
		Pokhra	18	613 7 6	15	1			429 2 0	2	150 5 6	2	15,640 5 6						2	15,640 5 6	
		Ahyapur										1	556 8 0						1	556 8 0	
		Bihilwal	3	159 12 0	3				159 12 0												
	Sitapur	Deokaliagana	1	22 9 9	1																
SITAPUR	Hardoi	Asipur	1	57 8 6	1				57 8 6												
		Durgaganj	1	214 8 7	1				214 8 7												
		Bhajera	1		1																
	Kheri	Bahadurnagar	4	257 8 6	4																
		Gularainagar	1	655 3 6	1				655 3 6												
		Palia	1	85 12 11						1	85 12 11										
FYZABAD	Gonda	Utraula estate										3	662 11 0	1	1	1		2 0 0			
		Paska	2	2,560 2 8			1			1	1,510 2 0										
	Bahraich	Rahua	3	124 0 0						3	124 0 0	1	87 12 0	1							
		Karri Sadauli	1	110 0 0	1				110 0 0												
		Bhera Gobindpur	1	8 0 0	1				8 0 0												
		Bahira	3	177 8 0	2	1			136 0 0			2	159 0 0	2							
		Korihar Sataon										1	122 4 0		1						
		Bodhampur										1		1							
	Rae Bareli	Shankarpur																			
		Ganra	1	300 0 0	1				300 0 0			1	268 5 4	1							
		Pandri Ganeshpur	2	297 8 0	2				297 8 0			1									
		Sehgon Pachneya											71 0 0				1				
RAE BARELI		Lodhwari	1	192 12 0	1				192 12 0			1	32 4 0	1							
		Bindhra	2	1,135 5 0	2				1,135 5 0												
		Kerwar	7	2,798 1 9	4	1			523 11 1	2	44 4 0	3	741 8 0	1			1		1	704 8 0	
		Mahdona	5	1,678 14 6	4	1			202 13 6			3	270 0 0	1			1		1	125 0 0	
	Sultanpur	Partabpur										2	597 0 0			1			1	50 0 0	
		Bhadayan	2	212 10 0	2				210 0 0			1	13 0 0	1							
		Uuchgaon										1	5 0 0	1							
		Walipur	1	(a)						1		2	35 0 0		1			10 0 0	1	20 0 0	(a) Cannot be valued.
		Kaithola	5	399 5 9	5				399 5 9			2	545 13 0		1		1	67 0 0			
		Madhpur	2	1,003 0 0	1	1			993 0 0			2	683 10 6			1			1	7 15 6	
	Partabgarh	Bargon	1	3 0 0	1				3 0 0			1	283 14 0								Result not certified.
		Shamspur	1	3,000 0 0	1				3,000 0 0			5	2,862 6 7	2	1			2,050 0 0	2	421 0 7	
		Dahiawán										1	120 0 0						1	120 0 0	
		Bamhaopur	2	180 0 0						2	180 0 0										
		Oudh Total	83	17,148 9 9	65	5	1		9,909 8 8	12	2,094 8 5	37	23,777 5 11	13	5	4	3	2,129 0 0	11	17,885 5 7	
		N.-W. P. and Oudh Total	142	46,788 10 10	110	10	2		19,989 0 0	20	16,142 9 5	67	82,628 7 1	25	12	8	3	6,091 15 6	18	36,835 11 7	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which Court of Wards was party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, the District Courts of appeal between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Name of estate.	Court of Wards, Appellant.									Court of Wards, Respondent.									Remarks.
			No. for disposal.	Value of claims in appeal.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeal pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims in appeal.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeal pending.	
				Rs a. p.					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a p.	
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor	Sherkote	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Moradabad	Kunj Behari Lal	1	1,131 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,131 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Suraj Narayan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,148 15 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Shâhjahânpur	Fakr-ud-din Khan.	1	136 7 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
ALLAHABAD	Allahabad	Partabchand	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	15 6 3	...	...	...	...	...	1	15 6 3	
		Jang Bahadur	1	238 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	(a) 238 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	(a) Result not certified.
	Jaunpur	Dube	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	
BENARES	Gorakhpur	Majhauli	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	500 0 0	
		Total, N.-W. P.	3	1,506 1 0	...	1	...	...	...	2	1,369 10 0	5	1,864 5 3	2	...	...	...	...	3	565 6 3	
		OUDH.																			
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	Itaunja	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	125 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Kakra	1	298 3 6	1	...	...	...	298 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
SITAPUR	Barabanki	Bhilwal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	696 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Kheri	Gularianagar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	655 3 6	
FYZABAD	Gonda	Utraula	1	259 11 0	...	1	...	...	86 9 0	...	...	1	655 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	
RAE BARELI	Rae Bareli	Bhiragobindpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Shankarpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	30 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
												2	750 0 0 550 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Gaura	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	340 10 0	1	1	...	...	40 10 0	...	...	
		Pandri Ganeshpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Benohra	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Sultanpur	Walipur	1	15 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Karwar	1	857 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	857 8 0	2	153 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Partabgarh	Kaithola	1	588 8 0	...	...	a1	...	...	...	...	2	225 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Madhpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	2,593 6 0	1	1	...	...	346 6 0	1	993 0 0	
		Bargon	1	2,100 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	341 13 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Shamspur	1	2,050 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,050 0 0	1	2,300 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	
		Total, Oudh	7	20,976 14 6	1	3	1	...	384 12 6	2	2,907 8 0	18	9,753 0 6	13	2	...	...	387 0 0	3	3,948 3 6	
		Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	10	27,482 15 6	1	4	1	...	384 12 6	4	4,277 2 0	23	11,617 5 9	15	2	...	...	387 0 0	6	4,513 9 9	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which Court of Wards is a party and which were pending before, or finally decided by, the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1884, and September the 30th, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Name of estate.	Court of Wards Appellant.									Court of Wards Respondent.									Remarks.
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeal pending.	Number of disposal	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims in appeals pending.	
				Rs. a. p					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs a. p.	
Meerut ...	Muzaffarnagar ...	Sambalhera ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	1,07,477 11 7	...	...	...	...	...	(a)4	26,723 2 9	(a)One case more remanded for further trial, and pending before Judge of Saháranpur, value Rs. 80,754-8-10.
	Bulandshahr ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	38,290 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Rohilkhand ...	Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam.	1	5,84,490 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Benares ...	Gházipur ...	Anapur estate...	1	2,010 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,010 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		N.-W. Provinces,	2	5,86,500 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	1	2,010 0 0	6	1,45,677 11 7	...	...	...	...	...	4	26,723 2 9	
	OUDH.																				
Sitapur ...	Hardoi ...	Marwar ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	320 10 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Rae Bareli ...	Rae Bareli ...	Gaura ...	1	40 10 0	1	...	...	...	40 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Pandri Ganeshpur.	3	79,495 0 0	3	...	...	...	79,495 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Sultanpur ...	Kurwar ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	401 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Partabgarh ...	Kalthola ...	1	463 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	463 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Shamspur ...	1	217 15 9	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Bargaon ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	27,146 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		Oudh, Total ...	6	80,216 9 9	4	1	...	...	79,535 10 0	1	463 0 0	3	27,867 10 0	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	
		N.-W. P. and Oudh Total.	8	6,66,716 9 9	4	1	1	...	79,535 10 0	2	2,473 0 0	9	1,73,545 5 7	4	...	...	...	...	4	(a) 26,723 2 9	

APPEN

STATEMENT IV.—*Return showing what portion of the amount decreed in favour of Court of Wards was*

			Outstanding.			Awarded.			Total.			Rec
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Meerut.	Muzaffarnagar.	Sambalhera ...	...	...	1,945 14 0	...	...	104 11 0	...	...	2,050 9 0	...
		Jaula ...	...	...	...	165 3 1	7 6 3	37 3 9	165 3 1	7 6 3	37 3 9	...
	Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	2,429 10 11	...	331 3 11	(a)2,722 9 6	...	494 12 5	5,152 4 5	...	826 0 4	975 0 1
		Karam Ali ...	...	...	...	17 0 0	...	5 0 9	17 0 0	...	5 0 9	17 0 0
	Bulandshahr.	T. B. Skinner ...	...	...	759 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	759 0 0	...
Agra.	Muttra ...	Din Dayal ...	20,479 10 3	380 0 0	411 13 3	...	...	88 7 9	20,479 10 3	380 0 0	500 5 0	20,469 10 3
	Farukhabad...	Khimsipur ...	...	...	335 5 3	...	...	50 5 9	...	...	385 11 0	...
	Mainpuri ...	Karaoli ...	...	...	657 9 6	...	...	19 2 0	...	...	676 11 6	...
		Arjanpur ...	688 0 9	...	92 4 0	...	...	24 10 9	638 0 9	...	116 14 9	...
	Etawah ...	Chakarnagar ...	...	...	...	...	...	20 2 0	...	...	20 2 0	...
Rohilkhand.	Bijnor ...	Sherkot ...	4,577 4 6	(b)447 4 11	(b)1,069 3 2	378 14 3	94 12 7	28 7 6	4,956 2 9	542 1 6	1,157 10 8	613 1 3
		Sahanpur ...	207 8 6	43 7 3	66 10 9	...	20 7 0	0 8 0	207 8 6	63 14 3	67 2 9	...
	Moradabad ...	Bishambarnath ...	792 3 9	528 11 5	192 9 9	646 0 0	604 13 8	271 11 9	1,438 3 9	1,133 9 1	464 5 6	...
		Kunj Behari Lal ...	...	...	...	1,357 2 7	44 0 0	445 7 8	1,357 2 7	44 0 0	445 7 8	...
		Bhim Singh ...	1,528 6 6	...	60 8 0	...	...	...	1,528 6 6	...	60 8 0	1,528 6 6
		Budh Prakash ...	75 0 0	24 4 3	79 8 3	...	...	5 6 2	75 0 0	24 4 3	84 14 5	...
		Manauwar Ali Khan ...	...	70 12 6	514 2 3	...	...	3 2 0	...	70 12 6	517 4 3	...
		Kazi Muhammad Abbas,	...	...	51 10 9	...	...	1 2 0	...	...	52 12 9	...
		Surajnarayan ...	...	...	(c)13 0 0	...	...	15 0 0	...	...	28 0 0	...
	Budaun ...	Ahmad Hussain Khan ...	230 11 0	...	54 14 0	956 0 6	...	200 13 6	1,186 11 6	...	315 11 0	88 0 6
		Chintamani ...	29 4 5	...	...	...	...	...	29 4 5	...	...	29 4 5
	Bareilly ...	Durga Parshad ...	750 0 0	...	163 0 0	...	...	241 8 10	750 0 0	...	404 8 10	750 0 0
		Mashuk M. Begam ...	...	...	...	...	...	16 9 0	...	...	16 9 0	...
	Shahjahanpur.	Fakhar-ud-din Khan ...	135 2 3	...	180 5 6	407 2 1	...	25 6 3	542 4 4	...	205 11 9	537 0 10
		Narainpur ...	...	...	6 5 0	90 0 0	...	20 1 0	90 0 0	...	26 6 0	...
		Kakra ...	283 11 10	...	16 14 0	...	...	...	283 11 10	...	16 14 0	...
		Pawayan ...	3,810 12 9	...	2,191 8 9	389 11 6	...	119 0 2	4,250 8 3	...	2,310 9 11	161 11 0
Allahabad.	Cawnpore ...	Ratanpur ...	...	...	...	70 0 0	...	98 4 0	70 0 0	...	98 4 0	...
	Fatehpur ...	Bisharat Husain ...	315 12 0	...	17 5 9	...	...	14 10 6	315 12 0	...	32 0 3	35 15 9
	Banda ...	Ganesh Singh ...	...	...	...	...	...	12 12 3	...	...	12 12 3	...
	Allahabad ...	Partab Chand ...	17,949 12 6	22,223 13 5	98 5 3	...	283 5 9	38 0 0	17,949 12 6	22,507 3 2	136 5 3	35 0 0
		Mumtaz Husain ...	123 3 0	7 8 0	25 13 6	...	7 8 0	4 0 0	123 3 0	15 0 0	29 13 6	...
		Raghuraj Singh ...	58 10 0	12 2 0	11 10 0	...	...	12 1 6	58 10 0	12 2 0	23 11 6	22 0 6
		Ganesh Kuar ...	619 0 9	...	...	...	...	...	619 0 9	...	...	43 5 4
		Jang Bahadur ...	...	...	...	...	...	2 8 0	...	...	2 8 0	...
	Jaunpur ...	Dube ...	2,214 9 3	...	260 14 0	1,000 0 0	5 6 1	146 8 6	3,214 9 3	5 6 1	407 7 0	27 10 3
		Sawai Mir ...	1,865 6 5	...	118 13 9	...	...	20 12 0	1,865 6 5	...	139 9 9	...
Benares.	Mirzapur ...	Barhar ...	1,480 11 0	...	279 15 6	...	...	...	1,480 11 0	...	279 15 6	1,480 11 0
	Ghazipur ...	Harshankar Parshad Singh.	...	...	327 9 6	...	...	16 9 6	...	...	344 3 0	...
	Gorakhpur ...	Majhauli ...	119 8 0	16 15 0	25 1 0	1,906 2 0	9 13 0	286 4 2	1,995 10 0	26 12 0	311 5 2	102 10 0
		Damri ...	301 0 0	310 14 8	91 1 0	...	...	60 1 4	301 0 0	310 14 8	151 2 4	301 0 0
		Chaumukha ...	335 15 9	224 13 9	914 0 9	...	...	108 2 6	335 15 9	224 13 9	1,022 3 3	299 0 0
		Bansgaon ...	...	...	258 11 11	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	262 11 11	...
	Ballia ...	Sunwaili ...	...	...	1,262 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	1,262 5 0	...
Jhansi.	Jhansi ...	Chirgaon ...	201 15 1	...	21 12 0	...	...	...	201 15 1	...	21 12 0	...
		Total, N.W. P. ...	61,642 15 2	24,299 11 2	12,905 13 6	10,065 13 6	1,077 8 4	3,183 6 3	71,708 12 8	25,368 3 6	16,090 3 9	27,159 7 8
Lucknow.	Lucknow ...	Itaunja ...	82 1 3	...	9 12 0	741 2 9	...	107 13 0	823 4 0	...	117 9 0	615 0 0
	Bara Banki ...	Jasmanda ...	540 12 6	...	97 11 0	60 12 0	...	39 3 0	601 8 6	...	136 14 0	317 11 9
		Poklira ...	440 3 6	...	75 15 0	428 12 0	...	106 2 3	869 0 0	...	182 1 3	169 3 3
		Aliyapur ...	41 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	...	2 8 0	41 0 0	...	9 6 0	...
		Kharka ...	...	...	...	298 3 6	...	91 13 6	298 3 6	...	91 13 6	298 3 6
		Bhilwal ...	6 15 9	...	8 10 6	159 12 0	...	25 13 0	223 11 9	...	34 7 6	81 6 9
Sitapur.	Sitapur ...	Deokalia ...	...	...	...	22 9 9	...	6 0 3	22 9 9	...	6 0 3	0 9 0
		Bamnowa ...	99 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	99 8 0	...	...	99 8 0
		Bajehra ...	26 0 0	...	3 10 0	...	...	...	26 0 0	...	3 10 0	8 6 0
	Hardoi ...	Marwar ...	171 6 0	...	181 13 9	...	...	41 12 0	171 6 0	...	223 9 9	...
		Mansurgarh ...	15 4 0	...	4 2 0	...	...	...	15 4 0	...	4 2 0	...
		Asafpur ...	...	...	...	57 8 6	...	12 8 0	57 8 6	...	12 8 0	...
		Durgaganj ...	...	...	...	214 8 0	...	19 11 0	214 8 0	...	19 11 0	...
		Bhaghiden ...	...	...	...	...	...	75 9 0	...	...	75 9 0	...
		Guswa ...	...	...	...	...	...	66 0 0	...	...	66 0 0	...
	Kheri ...	Bahadurnagar ...	86 8 9	...	17 11 0	...	...	...	86 8 9	...	17 11 0	2 0 0
Fyzabad.	Fyzabad ...	Golana ...	...	...	...	...	...	73 8 0	...	...	73 8 0	...
	Bahraich ...	Ruhwa ...	1,017 3 0	...	70 6 0	...	...	30 8 3	1,017 3 0	...	100 14 3	221 0 9
		Mehrabad ...	...	...	373 14 8	...	...	...	...	...	371 14 8	...
		Utraula ...	...	...	436 5 0	...	...	2 13 0	...	...	439 2 0	...
	Gonda ...	Paska ...	223 15 0	...	12 2 6	...	...	3 12 0	223 15 0	...	15 14 0	13 14 6
Rae Bareli.	Rae Bareli ...	Kurri Sadhali ...	98 14 5	...	11 12 3	1,309 10 11	...	384 5 0	1,408 9 4	...	396 1 3	...
		Bahira ...	303 14 9	...	200 11 8	136 2 0	...	42 15 6	440 0 9	...	243 11 2	301 2 9
		Shankarpur ...	...	...	9 15 0	...	...	100 15 0	...	...	110 14 0	...
		Pandriganeshpur ...	1,315 9 0	...	2,313 15 6	...	...	9,482 9 2	1,315 9 0	...	11,826 8 8	...
		Gaura ...	217 7 1	...	7 14 0	...	...	124 12 3	217 7 1	...	132 10 3	106 15 3
		Bihchra ...	281 15 3	...	24 2 6	135 5 0	...	214 12 6	417 4 3	...	238 15 0	86 15 3
		Sehgou Pachneya ...	193 1 9	...	14 9 6	...	...	...	193 1 9	...	14 9 6	135 10 6
		Lodhwari ...	317 11 9	...	7 2 0	533 9 6	...	52 14 0	851 5 3	...	60 0 0	129 11 9
		Badhanpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	1 0 0	...	...	1 0 0	...
Rae Bareli.	Sultanpur ...	Karwar ...	799 4 3	52 15 5	154 12 6	149 5 9	...	99 15 3	948 10 0	52 15 5	254 11 9	879 1 3
		Mahdona ...	182 8 9	...	722 4 3	195 13 6	...	42 1 6	378 6 3	...	724 5 9	183 6 9
		Pali ...	26 5 0	...	42 6 0	...	...	4 14 0	26 5 0	...	47 4 0	...
		Cehgaon ...	203 15 3	...	42 2 9	...	...	16 3 6	203 15 3	...	68 6 3	51 7 11
		Wali ...	308 15 7	...	79 11 0	...	...	14 0 0	308 15 7	...	93 11 0	67 15 9
		Bhadayon ...	...	...	...	...	...	20 0 0	...	...	20 0 0	11 10 0
	Partabgarh ...	Kutbolla ...	...	...	(d)695 7 9	11 15 0	...	11 10 0	11 15 0	...	718 6 0	17 12 0
		Rajapur ...	...	...	(d)119 9 4	151 5 9	...	151 5 9	151 5 9	...	271 0 4	...
		Madhpur ...	...	...	(d)111 14 0	...	...	11 7 0	...	...	111 14 0	...
		Bargaon ...	...	...	(d)1,4 1 6 4	373 1 6	...	6 0 0	373 1 6	...	2,031 6 10	3 0 0
		Shamspur ...	...	...	(d)248 15 9	3 0 0	...	323 4 0	3 0 0	...	572 3 9	...
		Oudh, Total ...	7,056 8 7	52 15 5	7,547 10 6	4,611 3 5	...	12,698 5 2	11,667 12 0	52 15 5	20,245 15 8	2,709 15 8
		N.-W. P. and Oudh Total	68,699 7 9	24,343 10 7	20,451 8 0	14,677 0 11	1,077 8 4	15,881 11 5	87,376 8 8	25,421 2 11	36,336 3 5	31,259 7 4

(a) The outstandings were shown last year as being only Rs. 2,713.
(b) Difference in excess of Rs. 355 due to the omission of interest.
(c) Difference of Rs. 590-2-7 in the total balance, due to mistakes in
(d) Detail not given.

DIX C.

realized or remitted during the year 1884-85, *and the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October*, 1885.

...ized.		Balance.			Remitted.			Net balances.			Analysis of balances.		
Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Cost.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
...	...	...	...	2,050 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	2,050 9 0	1,328 15 0	721 10 0	...
...	...	165 3 1	7 6 3	37 3 9	...	...	...	165 3 1	7 6 3	37 3 9	209 13 1	...	...
...	367 5 5	4,177 4 4	...	458 10 11	360 0 0	...	76 5 9	3,817 4 4	...	384 5 11	4,199 10 3	...	...
...	5 0 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	759 0 0	...	...	759 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
380 0 0	500 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	310 0 0	...	...	75 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	75 11 0	29 7 0	45 4 0	...
...	673 6 0	...	...	3 5 6	...	...	...	...	...	3 5 6	3 5 6	...	...
...	...	688 0 9	...	116 14 9	...	...	...	688 0 9	...	116 14 9	804 15 6	...	...
...	20 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
241 1 0	127 9 7	4,343 1 6	301 0 6	1,030 1 1	...	...	...	4,343 1 6	301 0 6	1,030 1 1	5,127 15 9	4,546 3 4	...
...	...	207 8 6	63 14 3	67 2 9	...	...	...	207 8 6	63 14 3	67 2 9	338 9 6	...	...
11 15 7	86 15 1	1,498 3 9	1,121 9 6	377 6 1	...	...	...	1,498 3 9	1,121 9 6	377 6 1	2,997 3 4	...	...
...	...	1,357 2 7	44 0 0	445 7 8	...	...	...	1,357 2 7	44 0 0	445 7 8	1,845 10 3	...	...
...	50 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
11 3 6	80 14 6	75 9 0	13 0 9	3 15 11	...	6 13 8	...	75 0 0	6 4 1	3 15 11	85 4 0	...	...
...	40 0 0	...	70 12 6	477 4 3	...	7 9 9	477 4 3	...	63 2 9	...	63 2 9	...	...
...	51 10 9	...	...	1 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	1 2 0	1 2 0	...	...
...	26 14 0	...	...	1 2 0	...	...	0 13 0	...	...	0 6 0	0 6 0	...	...
...	126 7 6	1,143 11 0	...	189 4 6	51 1 9	...	...	1,097 9 3	...	189 4 6	972 10 0	153 1 9	158 1 6
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	404 8 10	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	16 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	205 11 0	5 3 6	...	...	...	...	...	5 3 6	...	...	...	5 3 6	...
...	6 5 0	90 0 0	...	20 1 0	...	...	...	90 0 0	...	20 1 0	110 1 0	...	...
...	...	283 11 10	...	16 14 0	...	...	...	283 11 10	...	16 14 0	300 9 10	...	...
...	1,106 7 4	4,088 13 3	...	1,204 1 7	...	...	...	4,088 13 3	...	1,204 1 7	5,292 14 10	...	...
...	6 6 0	70 0 0	...	91 14 0	...	...	...	70 0 0	...	91 14 0	161 14 0	...	...
...	3 14 6	281 12 3	...	20 1 9	229 10 2	...	17 5 9	52 2 1	...	10 12 0	62 14 1	...	...
...	...	...	...	12 12 3	...	...	...	...	...	12 12 3	12 12 3	...	...
4,870 15 11	31 14 6	17,919 12 6	17,636 3 3	104 6 9	307 5 5	57 5 5	10 12 0	17,612 7 1	17,578 13 10	94 10 9	33,389 13 0	...	1,904 3 8
...	...	123 3 0	15 0 0	29 13 0	...	...	...	123 3 0	15 0 0	29 13 0	1 8 0 6	...	...
12 2 0	23 11 6	36 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	36 9 6	...	...	36 9 6	...	...
...	...	575 11 5	...	...	...	...	...	575 11 5	...	...	575 11 5	...	...
...	2 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
5 6 1	101 0 6	3,186 15 0	...	203 6 6	268 2 0	...	42 7 0	2,918 13 0	...	261 15 6	3,182 12 0	...	...
...	...	1,865 0 5	...	129 9 9	1,538 1 11	...	107 12 0	327 4 6	...	31 11 9	...	138 6 3	220 12 0
...	279 15 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	94 13 0	...	...	249 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	249 6 0	249 6 0	...	...
16 15 0	83 4 0	1,883 0 0	9 13 0	228 1 2	...	...	...	1,883 0 0	9 13 0	228 1 2	2,120 14 2	...	...
310 14 8	151 2 4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
224 13 9	151 10 3	36 15 9	...	870 9 0	...	...	853 8 0	36 15 9	...	17 1 0	54 0 9	...	...
...	...	...	...	262 11 11	...	...	...	...	...	262 11 11	262 11 11	...	...
...	...	...	...	1,262 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	1,262 5 0	1,262 5 0	...	...
...	...	201 15 1	...	21 12 0	...	...	...	201 15 1	...	21 12 0	223 11 1	...	...
6,985 7 6	5,147 0 5	44,249 5 0	19,282 12 0	10,943 3 4	2,754 5 9	71 11 10	7,315 2 0	41,494 15 3	19,211 0 2	8,598 1 4	61,407 2 9	5,313 12 10	2,283 1 3
...	99 7 0	208 4 0	...	27 2 0	...	...	...	208 4 0	...	27 2 0	235 6 0	...	...
...	112 11 9	283 12 9	...	24 2 3	...	...	...	283 12 9	...	24 2 3	159 4 0	105 14 0	43 0 0
...	38 2 0	699 9 3	...	143 15 3	...	...	...	699 9 3	...	143 15 3	511 6 9	134 9 9	117 9 0
...	...	41 0 0	...	9 6 0	...	...	...	41 0 0	...	9 8 0	54 0 0	...	...
...	91 13 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	21 6 6	142 5 0	...	13 1 0	...	...	...	142 5 0	...	13 1 0	155 6 0	...	...
...	6 0 3	22 0 9	...	...	...	...	...	22 0 9	...	...	22 0 9	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	3 10 0	17 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	17 10 0	...	...	17 10 0	...	...
...	...	171 6 0	...	223 9 9	...	...	...	171 6 0	...	223 9 9	394 15 9	...	...
...	...	15 4 0	...	4 2 0	...	...	...	15 4 0	...	4 2 0	19 6 0	...	...
...	...	57 8 6	...	12 8 0	...	...	...	57 8 6	...	12 8 0	70 0 0	...	...
...	...	214 8 0	...	19 11 0	...	...	...	214 8 0	...	19 11 0	234 3 0	...	...
...	...	...	...	75 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	75 9 0	75 9 0	...	...
...	...	...	...	66 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	66 0 0	66 0 0	...	...
...	17 11 0	84 8 3	...	...	58 15 9	...	...	25 9 0	...	...	25 9 0	...	...
...	...	...	...	73 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	73 8 0	73 8 0	...	...
...	49 8 6	796 2 3	...	60 5 9	10 0 0	...	3 7 9	786 2 3	...	56 14 0	209 0 0	...	634 9 3
...	373 14 8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	429 7 0	...	...	9 11 0	...	...	3 6 0	...	...	6 5 0	6 5 0	...	...
...	2 12 0	210 0 6	...	13 2 6	...	...	...	210 0 6	...	13 2 6	...	223 3 0	...
...	30 0 0	1,448 9 4	...	366 1 3	...	...	...	1,448 9 4	...	366 1 3	1,774 10 7	...	...
...	75 13 2	138 14 0	...	187 14 0	...	...	...	138 14 0	...	187 14 0	326 12 0	...	...
...	57 11 0	...	...	53 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	53 3 0	53 3 0	...	...
...	16,811 1 2	1,315 9 0	...	1,015 7 6	...	...	...	1,315 9 0	...	1,015 7 0	1,759 7 0	...	571 9 0
...	82 4 0	110 7 10	...	50 6 3	...	...	...	110 7 10	...	50 6 3	160 14 1	...	...
...	190 12 9	330 5 0	...	48 2 3	...	...	...	330 5 0	...	48 2 3	378 7 3	...	...
...	14 9 6	59 7 3	...	...	...	...	...	59 7 3	...	...	15 10 1	43 13 0	...
...	25 4 0	723 9 6	...	34 12 0	...	...	...	723 9 6	...	34 12 0	758 5 0	...	...
...	1 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	228 5 3	68 8 9	52 15 5	26 6 6	44 1 4	...	5 7 0	24 7 5	52 15 5	20 15 6	96 1 4	2 5 0	...
...	82 2 0	195 0 0	...	682 3 9	...	...	...	195 0 0	...	682 3 9	237 0 0	0 1 1	640 2 0
...	36 14 0	26 5 0	...	10 6 0	26 5 0	...	10 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	190 3 10
...	0 7 0	152 7 4	...	67 15 3	20 16 3	...	9 3 6	131 8 1	...	58 11 9	...	...	...
...	7 14 0	240 15 10	...	85 13 0	...	...	...	240 15 10	...	85 13 0	326 12 10	...	...
...	20 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	18 8 3	133 9 9	...	730 13 9	...	...	566 0 6	133 9 9	...	164 13 9	298 7 0	...	...
...	55 6 0	...	...	45 10 4	...	...	22 10 9	...	...	22 15 7	22 15 7	...	...
...	232 0 0	...	...	252 12 0	...	...	...	...	...	252 12 0	196 0 0	59 12 6	...
...	17 8 6	...	...	2,013 14 4	...	...	...	...	...	2,013 14 4	2,013 14 4	...	...
...	...	...	...	572 3 9	...	...	...	...	...	572 3 9	572 3 9	...	...
...	13,226 0 9	7,867 12 4	52 15 5	7,019 14 11	160 5 4	...	620 9 6	7,707 7 0	52 15 5	6,399 5 5	11,368 10 7	556 10 6	2,196 7 1
6,985 7 6	18,373 1 2	52,117 1 4	19,315 11 5	17,963 2 3	2,914 11 1	71 11 10	2,935 11 6	49,202 6 3	19,263 15 7	14,997 6 3	72,801 11 0	4,180 7 4	4,479 8 3

This was an error in the Collector's returns; they should have been Rs. 2,760.
from several cases in the returns of the preceding year.
interest calculated up on the several suits' decrees outstanding.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Court of Wards under decrees of Court between the 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885.*

Division.	District.	Name of Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of Disbursements. Amount, including costs, awarded against Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	Total.	Remarks.
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Muzaffarnagar ...	Sambalhera ...	...	7,471 0 5	10 0 0	1,066 11 5	8,547 11 10	
		Jauli ...	...	506 5 2	5 0 0	0 5 0	11 10 2	
	Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	1,342 5 5	...	191 12 6	...	191 12 6	
		Karam Ali ...	22 0 9	...	6 5 9	...	6 5 9	
	Bulandshahr ...	Skinner ...	...	1,102 8 0	...	...	1,102 8 0	
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Din Dyal ...	599 15 9	...	...	...	...	
	Agra ...	Parna ...	...	93 0 0	15 8 6	...	38 8 6	
	Farukhabad ...	Khimsipur ...	310 0 0	...	12 13 0	...	12 13 0	
		Karauli ...	673 6 0	...	52 5 0	...	52 5 0	
		Arjunpur ...	...	...	24 10 0	...	24 10 0	
	Etáwah ...	Bhare ...	...	...	...	8 11 0	8 11 0	
		Chakranagar ...	20 2 0	...	...	20 0 0	20 0 0	
BOHILKHAND ...	Bijnor ...	Sherkote ...	981 11 10	...	...	119 14 3	119 14 3	
		Sahanpur ...	...	981 4 9	...	...	981 4 9	
		Tilokpur ...	...	2,070 0 0	...	...	2,070 0 0	
		Mansurpur ...	...	24 15 2	...	...	24 15 2	
	Moradabad ...	Bishambharnath ...	98 15 0	...	141 8 0	15 2 0	156 10 0	
		Kunj Bihari Lal ...	...	...	804 1 0	...	804 1 0	
		Budh Prakash ...	92 2 0	...	...	...	...	
		Kazi Muhammad Abbas ...	51 10 9	...	...	4 9 0	4 9 0	
		Manawar Ali ...	40 0 0	...	3 2 0	1 8 0	4 10 0	
		Suraj Narain ...	26 14 0	...	...	170 15 0	170 15 0	
	Budaun ...	Ahmad Hussain Khan ...	154 11 6	...	225 0 0	113 5 6	338 5 6	
		Chintamani ...	29 4 5	...	188 10 0	...	188 10 0	
	Bareilly ...	Durga Prasad ...	1,154 8 10	17 6 9	58 11 0	...	76 1 9	
		Mashuk Mahal ...	16 9 0	...	81 0 0	11,661 9 6	11,742 9 6	
	Shâhjahânpur ...	Fakruddin Khan ...	742 12 7	...	68 15 7	...	68 15 7	
		Narainpur ...	6 5 0	...	20 6 0	...	20 6 0	
		Kakra ...	...	...	16 14 0	...	16 14 0	
		Powayan ...	1,358 2 4	...	147 4 2	4 5 0	151 9 2	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Ratanpur ...	6 5 0	...	...	19 12 0	19 12 0	
	Fatehpur ...	Bisharat Hussain ...	37 6 3	...	12 3 0	...	12 3 0	
		Balwant Rao ...	...	...	...	1 0 0	1 0 0	
	Bánda ...	Ganesh Singh ...	...	...	...	3 0 0	3 0 0	
	Allahabad ...	Jang Bahadur ...	2 8 0	...	...	...	..	
		Partab Chand ...	4,681 1 1	...	65 10 6	21 0 0	86 10 6	
		Mumtazuddin ...	...	...	4 0 0	...	4 0 0	
		Raghuraj Singh ...	57 14 0	...	12 1 6	...	12 1 6	
		Ganesh Koer ...	43 5 4	...	.	...	...	
	Jaunpur ...	Dube ...	133 8 10	53 0 0	302 9 3	10 15 0	365 8 3	
BENARES ...	Azamgarh ...	Ditto ...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	
	Mirzapur ...	Ditto ...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Benares ...	Ditto ...	...	...	54 6 0	21 12 0	76 2 0	
		Anapur ...	...	...	2 0 0	1 0 3	3 0 3	
	Gházipur ...	Ditto ...	...	...	658 10 10	82 5 12	741 0 9	
	Gorakhpur ...	Majhauli ...	202 13 0	...	...	...	...	
		Damri ...	763 1 0	...	...	...	...	
		Chaumukha ...	675 8 0	...	...	...	...	
	Basti ...	Mithwal ...	...	...	..	7 0 3	7 0 3	
		Fida Hussain ...	...	...	...	98 7 6	98 7 6	
	Ballia ...	Sunwani ...	...	...	...	781 10 0	781 10 0	
		Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	14,325 8 8	12,249 8 3	3,185 7 7	14,234 14 7	29,669 14 5	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by Court of Wards under decrees of Court between the 1st October, 1884, and 30th September, 1885*—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Name of Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of Disbursements. Amount, including costs, awarded against Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution of suits.	In defence of suits.	Total.	Remarks.
		OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	Itaunja ...	705 7 0	...	1 0 9	...	1 0 9	
	Bara Banki ...	Jasmanda ...	438 7 6	...	43 0 6	...	43 0 6	
		Pokra ...	207 8 9	...	35 7 3	...	35 7 3	
		Ahyapur ...	...	...	5 1 6	...	5 1 6	
		Khurka ...	380 1 1	...	...	...	...	
		Bhilwal ...	102 13 3	...	13 0 0	...	13 0 0	
SITAPUR ...	Sitapur ...	Deokalia ...	6 9 3	...	7 1 6	...	7 1 6	
		Bamnowa ...	99 8 0	...	...	...	...	
		Bajehra ...	12 0 0	...	...	...	...	
	Kheri ...	Bahadurnagar ...	19 11 0	...	...	...	...	
		Galarianagar ...	...	...	73 8 0	...	73 8 0	
		Palia ...	...	...	8 0 0	...	8 0 0	
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	... ...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Bahraich ...	Nahwa ...	261 9 3	...	27 0 6	20 5 6	47 6 0	
		Mehrabad ...	373 14 8	...	...	...	...	
	Gonda ...	Utraula ...	429 7 0	3 2 0	...	2 1 0	5 3 0	
		Paska ...	8 3 6	897 15 0	...	...	897 15 0	
BAE BARELI ...	Rae Bareli ...	Karri Sadauli ...	30 0 0	38 11 0	...	...	a464 14 4	a Details not given.
		Bahira ...	356 15 11	...	...	...	a124 0 6	
		Shankara ...	57 11 0	...	...	...	a187 11 3	
		Pandri Ganeshpur ...	10,811 1 2	756 10 6	...	...	a9,916 2 5	
		Gaura ...	189 3 3	...	...	...	a185 4 6	
		Binohra ...	277 12 0	...	...	...	a230 5 0	
		Sehgon ...	148 4 0	...	...	...	a1 4 0	
		Lodhwari ...	154 15 9	...	...	...	a61 3 0	
		Badhanpur ...	1 0 0	...	...	...	a3 11 6	
		Korihar Sataon ...	...	...	...	...	a26 5 3	
		Sahgaon Pachneya ...	...	...	...	...	a1 4 0	
		Bhuraj Gobindpur ...	...	...	...	...	a11 9 6	
	Sultanpur ...	Karwar ...	...	85 8 0	...	...	a219 15 3	
		Mahona ...	...	...	...	...	a177 11 6	
		Partabpur ...	...	...	...	...	a6 1 0	
		Falt ...	...	...	...	...	a4 14 0	
		Bhadayan ...	...	...	...	...	a23 6 0	
		Unchgaon ...	...	...	...	...	a15 12 6	
		Wallipur ...	...	2 3 0	...	...	a38 11 0	
	Partabgarh ...	Kaithola ...	38 10 3	37 11 3	115 11 0	58 4 6	211 10 9	
		Raja Pun ...	85 6 0	...	10 11 0	...	10 11 0	
		Madhpur ...	232 0 0	...	11 8 9	15 14 9	27 7 6	
		Bargon ...	28 8 6	...	35 13 8	30 10 3	66 7 11	
		Shamspur ...	...	...	155 12 9	5 1 3	160 13 3	
		Dantawan ...	...	...	...	1 8 3	1 8 3	
		Total, Oudh ...	15,466 12 1	1,821 12 9	542 12 5	133 13 6	13,317 8 8	
		Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...	29,792 4 9	14,071 5 0	3,728 4 0	1,557 12 1	42,987 5 1	

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits instituted by State, Municipal Boards and Court of Wards during year ending September 30th, 1885.

	Total.	Decisions. Favourable.		Unfavourable.		Compromised, withdrawn or remanded.		Pending.
Class I (a)—To recover money or property due under a contract.								
High Court	10	3	65,921 0 0	3	1,500 14 11	...	...	4	13,665 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	9	5	2,775 5 2	...	...	1	588 0 0	3	3,453 8 6
Original suits	141	105	22,650 13 0	11	5,755 8 0	6	13,753 5 5	19	68,213 9 8
Total ...	160	113	91,347 2 2	14	7,256 6 11	7	14,341 5 5	26	85,332 2 2
Class I (b)—For damages arising from breach of contract.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	224 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	2	...	...	1	100 0 0	1	7 0 0	...	...
Total ...	3	1	224 0 0	1	100 0 0	1	7 0 0	...	...
Class I (c)—To enforce specific performance of contract.									
High Court	1	1	192 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	2	2	228 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	3	3	420 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Class II.—To recover damages on account of torts.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	5	3	415 0 0	...	...	...	...	2	55 0 0
Original suits	16	8	1,335 11 9	4	83 0 0	...	...	4	501 0 7
Total ...	21	11	1,750 11 9	4	83 0 0	...	...	6	556 0 7
Class III.—For redemption or foreclosure of property.									
High Court	2	1	401 0 0	...	...	...	...	1	68,130 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0
Total ...	3	1	401 0 0	...	...	...	...	2	68,150 0 0
Class IV.—For declaration of right to, or for possession of, real property.									
High Court	19	10	29,505 10 1	1	51,648 6 9	1	5,84,490 0 0	7	22,392 8 1
District Courts of appeal ...	35	20	5,381 3 2	6	2,762 8 0	...	...	9	6,994 9 7
Original suits ...	99	48	11,565 5 0	17	4,883 3 6	9	1,620 0 0	24	(a)44,031 10 0
Total ...	153	78	46,450 2 3	24	59,294 2 3	10	5,86,110 0 0	40	(a)73,418 11 8
Class V.—Suits under the Land Rent Acts.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	1	...	...	1	15 0 0	...	...	...	...
Original suits	3	1	4 15 0	1	15 0 0	...	...	1	5,322 2 9
Total ...	4	1	4 15 0	2	30 0 0	...	...	1	5,322 2 9
Class VI.—To declare a personal right.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	3	...	...	1	2 0 0	1	49 12 0	1	371 0 0
Total ...	3	...	...	1	2 0 0	1	49 12 0	1	371 0 0
Class VII.—To set aside sales by, or orders of a Civil Court.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	3	3	616 8 3	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	3	3	616 8 3	...	...	...	...	...	...
Class VIII.—To set aside acts or orders passed by Officers of Government.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	6	2	50 0 0	1	49 5 0	...	...	3	15 0 0
Original suits	25	12	569 9 6	4	70 0 0	2	1,020 0 0	7	5,692 12 9
Total ...	31	14	619 9 6	5	119 5 0	2	1,020 0 0	10	5,707 12 9
Class IX.—Compensation for land acquired for public purposes.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	28	6	1,585 12 6	3	3,127 4 6	1	5,232 11 6	18	2,443 12 11
Total ...	28	6	1,585 12 6	3	3,127 4 6	1	5,232 11 6	18	2,443 12 11
Class X. Blank.									
Class XI.—Suits under Act XL. of 1858, XXVII. of 1860, &c.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Class XII.—References under Act X. of 1870, parts III, and IV.									
High Court	1	1	29 900 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Courts of appeal ...	2	1	32,300 0 0	...	...	...	...	1	7,160 0 0
Original suits	4	3	346 3 11	...	...	...	...	1	7,160 0 0
Total ...	7	5	62,546 3 11	...	...	...	...	2	14,320 0 0
Class XIII.—Miscellaneous.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District Court of appeal ...	1	1	1,148 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Original suits	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	1	1	1,148 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
GRAND TOTAL ...	421	237	2,07,115 0 4	55	70,012 2 8	22	6,06,760 12 11	106	a2,55,691 10 10

(a) Add to this one case, result not certified.

APPENDIX E.

Statement showing the progress made during the year ending 30th September, 1885, in realising Government dues in pauper suits in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

Division.	District.	Outstanding on 1st October, 1884.	Dues for the year under report.	Total.	Recovered.	Expunged.	Total.	Balance.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT.	Dehra Dún ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Saháranpur ...	1,900 10 0	2,086 4 0	3,986 14 0	1,016 4 0	220 0 0	1,236 4 0	2,750 10 0	
	Muzaffarnagar ...	1,157 11 0	50 0 0	1,207 11 0	701 4 0	23 13 0	725 1 0	482 10 0	
	Meerut ...	457 13 0	1,918 15 0	2,376 12 0	701 12 0	...	701 12 0	1,675 0 0	
	Bulandshahr ...	275 0 0	171 8 0	446 8 0	..	...	...	446 8 0	
	Allgarh ...	740 10 0	303 12 0	1,044 6 0	303 0 0	56 10 0	359 10 0	684 12 0	
	Total ...	4,531 12 0	4,530 7 0	9,062 3 0	2,722 4 0	300 7 0	3,022 11 0	6,039 8 0	
AGRA.	Muttra ...	...	3,905 1 6	3,905 1 6	...	2,690 4 0	2,690 4 0	1,214 13 6	
	Agra ...	807 3 10	2,643 15 6	3,451 3 4	227 7 6	1,069 11 10	1,297 3 4	2,154 0 0	
	Farukhabad ...	1,450 0 0	938 1 0	2,388 1 0	1,005 4 0	608 14 0	1,614 2 0	773 15 0	
	Mainpuri ...	...	87 0 0	87 0 0	20 4 0	...	20 4 0	66 12 0	
	Etáwah ...	...	16 8 0	16 8 0	16 8 0	...	16 8 0	...	
	Etah ...	118 0 0	...	118 0 0	8 12 0	...	8 12 0	109 4 0	
	Total ...	2,375 3 10	7,590 10 0	9,965 13 10	1,278 3 6	4,368 13 10	5,647 1 4	4,318 12 6	
ROHILKHAND.	Bijnor ...	82 12 0	19 12 0	102 8 0	60 5 0	42 3 0	102 8 0	...	
	Moradabad ...	460 15 0	517 12 5	978 11 5	26 4 0	365 4 4	391 8 4	587 3 1	
	Budaun ...	...	6 11 0	6 11 0	6 11 0	...	6 11 0	...	
	Bareilly ...	1,505 4 0	205 3 0	1,710 7 0	25 0 0	7 0 0	32 0 0	1,678 7 0	
	Sháhjahánpur ..	660 5 0	720 2 0	1,380 7 0	340 14 0	645 2 0	986 0 0	394 7 0	
	Pilibhit ...	0 10 6	440 1 0	440 11 6	189 4 7	124 12 5	314 1 0	126 10 6	
	Total ...	2,709 14 6	1,909 9 5	4,619 7 11	648 6 7	1,184 5 9	1,832 12 4	2,786 11 7	
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	1,842 13 3	2,303 2 0	4,145 15 3	169 8 0	2,279 12 0	2,449 4 0	1,696 11 3	
	Fatehpur ...	13 13 6	48 14 0	62 11 6	...	13 13 6	13 13 6	48 14 0	
	Búnda ...	...	202 7 0	202 7 0	...	...	...	202 7 0	
	Hamírpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Allahabad ...	139 14 0	2,080 8 0	2,220 6 0	29 6 6	444 14 0	474 4 6	1,746 1 6	
	Jaunpur ...	2,188 5 4	288 13 6	2,477 2 10	155 3 3	1,213 0 7	1,368 3 10	1,108 15 0	
	Total ...	4,184 14 1	4,923 12 6	9,108 10 7	354 1 9	3,951 8 1	4,305 9 10	4,803 0 9	
BENARES.	Azamgarh ...	300 15 0	515 4 0	816 3 0	96 7 0	...	96 7 0	719 12 0	
	Mirzapur ...	1,346 9 0	2,112 14 0	3,459 7 0	500 7 0	2,098 9 0	2,599 0 0	860 7 0	
	Benares ...	2,082 15 7	1,367 5 3	4,350 4 10	1,112 0 0	1,816 7 7	2,929 1 10	1,421 3 1	
	Gházipur ...	286 5 0	8 12 0	295 1 0	...	49 12 0	49 12 0	245 5 0	
	Gorakhpur ...	429 14 3	626 15 0	1,056 13 3	466 14 3	326 1 0	792 15 3	263 14 0	
	Basti ...	59 12 6	67 9 0	127 5 0	95 5 0	11 4 0	106 9 0	20 12 0	
	Ballia ...	505 7 6	125 13 6	631 5 0	126 10 6	93 3 0	219 13 6	411 7 6	
	Total ...	5,911 14 10	4,824 8 9	10,736 7 1	2,397 11 9	4,395 4 7	6,793 10 7	3,942 12 7	
JHÁNSI.	Jhánsi ...	318 2 0	854 4 0	1,172 6 0	337 14 3	192 12 6	530 10 9	641 11 3	
	Lalitpur ..	117 12 0	...	117 12 0	90 0 0	27 11 3	117 12 0	...	
	Total ...	435 14 0	854 4 0	1,290 2 0	427 15 0	221 7 9	648 6 9	641 11 3	
	GRAND TOTAL, N.-W. P.	20,149 9 3	24,633 3 8	44,782 12 5	7,828 10 7	14,420 15 0	22,250 3 10	22,532 8 8	
LUCKNOW.	Lucknow ...	101 2 3	1,582 11 6	1,683 13 9	1,167 10 9	294 15 9	1,462 10 6	221 3 3	
	Unao ...	904 2 3	216 14 0	1,121 0 3	358 3 0	384 10 0	742 13 0	378 3 3	
	Bara Banki ...	4 8 0	130 10 0	135 2 0	43 2 0	...	43 2 0	92 0 0	
	Total ...	1,009 12 6	1,930 8 6	2,940 0 0	1,568 15 9	679 9 9	2,248 9 6	691 6 6	
SITAPUR.	Sitapur ...	402 6 0	1,483 0 3	1,885 6 3	632 14 0	585 6 0	1,218 4 0	667 2 3	
	Hardoi ...	...	135 9 6	135 9 6	117 6 9	18 2 9	135 9 6	...	
	Kheri ...	...	3 6 0	3 6 0	...	...	...	3 6 0	
	Total ...	402 6 0	1,621 15 9	2,024 5 9	750 4 9	603 8 9	1,353 13 6	670 8 3	
FYZABAD.	Fyzabad ...	182 13 6	399 11 9	582 9 3	234 3 3	99 0 3	333 3 6	249 8 0	
	Gonda ...	167 12 0	13 14 6	181 10 6	119 14 0	10 0 0	129 14 0	51 12 0	
	Total ...	350 9 6	413 10 3	764 3 9	354 1 3	109 0 3	463 1 6	301 4 0	
RAE BARELI.	Rae Bareli ...	324 12 0	126 0 6	450 12 6	244 9 3	135 11 3	380 4 6	70 8 0	
	Sultanpur ...	...	51 6 0	51 6 0	51 6 0	...	51 6 0	...	
	Partabgarh ...	49 0 0	232 1 3	281 1 3	115 15 6	...	115 15 6	165 1 9	
	Total ...	373 12 0	409 7 9	783 8 9	411 14 9	135 11 3	547 10 0	235 9 9	
	GRAND TOTAL FOR OUDH.	2,136 8 0	4,375 5 3	6,511 13 3	3,085 4 6	1,527 14 0	4,613 2 6	1,898 12 6	
	GRAND TOTAL FOR N.-W. P. AND OUDH.	22,286 1 3	29,008 8 11	51,294 9 8	10,913 15 1	15,948 13 0	26,863 6 4	24,431 5 2	

ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

No. $\frac{209}{\text{VII—312-2}}$ OF 1886.

FROM

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH;

TO

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH.

DATED ALLAHABAD, THE 28TH OCTOBER, 1886.

SIR,

JUDL. DEPT. (CIVIL).

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your report for the year ending 30th September, 1885. It was due on 1st January, 1886, and is dated 26th February; but it was not received in this office till the beginning of June; and there were still many errata which took more time to correct. Both the delay in its preparation, and the necessity for frequent corrections, are explained by the difficulty you experienced in securing that the newly-prescribed forms should be correctly filled up. The same cause ought not to operate in the case of the returns for the current year, and you should be able to send in the report for 1885-86 with reasonable punctuality. I am further to explain that your report should bear the date on which the last proof is sent to the Press.

2. In allotting separate sections for the litigation as it related to (1) the State, (2) Municipalities, and (3) the Court of Wards, you have effected a sensible improvement on the arrangement which was adopted in previous years. I am to suggest for your consideration whether in future your reports might not be much reduced in length, without any diminution of their value to Government, if only the first section were dealt with in detail, merely a skeleton account being given of your work under the other two heads. Any remarks you might wish to make on Court of Wards' litigation would perhaps be more properly addressed to the Board of Revenue or to the Secretary in the Oudh Revenue Department, and incorporated by them, if they thought fit, in their annual reports on the administration of the Court. In the same way municipal litigation might be reported on to Commissioners of Divisions, and your observations communicated by them to the District Boards. No alteration need be made in the present appendices; and if in any case you had special reasons for inviting the attention of Government to the work you were doing for a municipality, it could form the subject of a separate reference.

3. There has been a considerable increase in the number of original cases which passed through your hands during the year under report, the rise having been from 147 in 1883-84 to 206 in 1884-85.

This increase is distributed between the different Departments by the following table:—

	1883-84.	1884-85	Percentage of increase.
State	55	63	15
Municipalities	21	54	127
Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces	71	89	25
Total ...	147	206	40

Besides this no less than 120 suits, which are not included in the above table, were brought by or against the Court of Wards in Oudh.

4. Final orders were given in 48 of the original suits by or against the State, and in nine only, or about 18 per cent., was the decree adverse. Four cases were compromised. Every case where the State was plaintiff was decreed in its favour. Five of the nine adverse decrees, in all of which the State was defendant, have been reversed in appeal, and one is still pending. The ultimate result of the litigation in which the State has been involved is that of 63 original cases 51 have been finally disposed of, and of these four only, or less than eight per cent., have been lost; while 12 were pending either in the court of original jurisdiction or in appeal. Of 19 appeals before the district courts 12 have been decided in favour of the State and one adversely. The remainder were pending.

5. The combined sum decreed in favour of the State during the year as principal and interest amounted to Rs. 3,353-9-6, to which a nearly equal amount (Rs. 3,315-9-1) was added as costs. Including arrears from previous years, the whole sum due under decree was Rs. 75,246, while the realizations on all accounts amounted to Rs. 4,798, or 6½ per cent. on the amount due, and not quite half as much again as the costs only which were decreed during the year. The results can hardly be thought satisfactory from a financial point of view, but they seem to be not inferior to those which are obtained elsewhere. They show very clearly, as you observe, that before any suit is instituted, great care should be taken to ascertain that the party proceeded against has the means of satisfying a decree passed against him. It is hoped that the officers who represent Government do not use less effort to secure payment than might be expected from private persons in realizing sums due under decrees to themselves.

6. In connexion with this subject, I am to say that it is not always easy to understand how certain calculations in your report are brought out, or what items of expenditure are taken into account It is stated, for instance, that the cost of litigation in Oudh, where there were 23 original suits and numerous appeals, only amounted to Rs. 195-15-0, and in the North-Western Provinces for 40 original cases, besides appeals, to Rs. 1,469; but the process of calculation is not verifiable from the report.

7 Of Rs. 51,254 due to Government on account of pauper suits Rs. 10,914, or 21 per cent., was recovered, and Rs. 15,943, or 31 per cent. expunged as irrecoverable. The ratios of both these sums to the total amount due correspond very closely with those of the preceding year The plan adopted by the Commissioner of Benares, of calling for periodical reports, might perhaps be introduced with advantage in other Divisions when the arrears are heavy

8. The litigation in which municipalities were concerned was generally unimportant in its character, and the only point in connection with it that seems worthy of remark is the small proportion borne by the number of suits decided to the number instituted. Your assistance seems to have been seldom asked for, and considering the insignificance of the sums at stake, it was probably not required. The amounts decreed were small, and not much interest seems to have been taken in their recovery.

9. The Board of Revenue, who are directly interested would seem to be the best qualified judges of the results of the litigation carried on in behalf of the Court of Wards in the North-Western Provinces. The number of suits in this Department was very large, amounting in all to 209; but the values were generally small; considerably more than half the cases were contributed by Oudh estates; and the demands on your time and attention were probably not often of a serious character. It was only to be expected that in some instances claims would be disputed which might, perhaps, have better been yielded or compromised; but on the whole the results you report are very satisfactory, and efforts seem to have been made both to ascertain the solvency of the defendant before suing, and to realize the debt when it was decreed. Of the 122 original cases which were instituted by the Court of Wards, only 10 were lost and 2 compromised, and the realizations amounted to Rs. 55,718, or 38 per cent., of a total demand on all accounts of Rs. 1,45,134. The realizations in Oudh were especially good, and amounted to 54 per cent. on the demand on all accounts and nearly 100 per cent. on the sums awarded during the year.

10. The cases in all Departments seem usually to have been instituted with judgment, and prosecuted or defended with success. The alterations in the tabular statements, though in themselves advantageous, render comparisons with the results of previous years difficult, and it is perhaps too early to pronounce a very decided opinion on the working of the new Department, though the Lieutenant-Governor has every reason to be satisfied with its present administration in your hands

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

W. C. BENETT,

Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.